

our political institutions. To facilitate and encourage the food supply at home, to augment and encourage the agricultural interests of a people, is the highest statesmanship of these days.

The first symptoms of an approaching aristocracy is an attempt to discriminate against or a contemptuous neglect of the agricultural interests. The line that divides the period of strength, virility, and power from the period of luxury, weakness, corruption, and decay in the history of every great country is that which marks the neglect of the agricultural interests. An abandoned farm ought to cause more distress and worry to the statesmen than bad laws or unwise policies. An abandoned farm is a menace to our national institutions and a standing indictment against the wisdom of our national policies. The home market without the presence of the farmer is a foreign market. Think of a home market with a foreigner in possession of it. And the premier says he will take possession of it under this agreement. Think of the family fireside with the eldest boy, who has worked longest and hardest and waited most patiently to share the comforts of industry and frugality, turned aside and some "Weary Willie," or brother tramp, who never expended a dollar for the old home, in his place. This may be economy, but it is both immoral and unpatriotic.

Mr. HEYBURN. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 3 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, June 29, 1911, at 12 o'clock meridian.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, June 29, 1911.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CULLOM presented petitions of the Christian Endeavor Union of Boston, Mass.; of the National Conference of Charities and Correction and of the Business Men's Association of New Haven, Conn., praying for the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the congregation of the First Seventh-day Adventist Church of Springfield, Ill., and memorials of sundry citizens of Princeton, Ill., remonstrating against the enforced observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. GALLINGER presented memorials of Local Grange of Hooksett; of Bear Hill Grange, of Henniker; and of Montcalm Grange, No. 70, of Enfield, all of the Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of New Hampshire, remonstrating against the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Claremont, N. H., praying for an extension of time within which the appropriation for the purchase of forest lands in the White Mountains is available, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. FLETCHER presented resolutions adopted by the Cotton Crushers' Association, praying for the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the City Council of Key West, Fla., praying for the cooperation of the United States Government at the Oversea Railroad celebration, to be held at Key West, Fla., which were presented to the Committee on Railroads.

Mr. BURTON presented a petition of sundry citizens, of Typographical Union No. 63, and of the Central Labor Union, of Toledo, Ohio, praying for the adoption of the proposed constitution of the Territory of Arizona, which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. LIPPITT presented resolutions adopted by the Republican Club of Greystone, R. I., favoring a political union between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HITCHCOCK presented a petition of the Commercial Club of Lincoln, Nebr., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the so-called corporation-tax law permitting corporations to make returns at the end of their fiscal years, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented a memorial of Local Division No. 2, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Norwich, Conn., remon-

strating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Business Men's Association of New Haven, Conn., praying for the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. GUGGENHEIM presented a memorial of the County Board, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Denver County, Colo., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

GOVERNMENT OF PORTUGAL.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, in the early part of the session, two or three months ago, I presented a resolution on the subject of the recognition of the establishment of a republic in Portugal, and had the resolution referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. No report has ever been made by that committee and, so far as I know or have been advised, no attention has been paid to the resolution. Nevertheless, I am glad to say that the executive department of the United States has finally recognized officially the Republic of Portugal, as shown by the cablegram which I ask may be inserted in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without reading?

Mr. CULBERSON. Without reading.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the matter will be inserted in the RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

UNITED STATES RECOGNIZES PORTUGAL—REPUBLICAN GOVERNMENT OF LAND FORMERLY RULED BY MANUEL IS UPHOLD.

LISBON, June 19, 1911.

The United States has officially recognized the Republic of Portugal. This followed the opening of the new constituent assembly this morning, at which the president of the chamber read a decree proclaiming the abolition of the monarchy and the banishment from Portugal of the royal family of Braganza, which was unanimously approved. The decree was also read by the president to the great throngs which gathered outside the assembly building.

George J. Lorillard, American chargé d'affaires, in the afternoon waited upon Sr. MacAdoo, minister of foreign affairs, and delivered a note which stated the United States officially recognizes the new Portuguese Government.

The day was observed as a public holiday throughout the whole country. Popular demonstrations in honor of the occasion were held everywhere, but no disorders are reported.

TREATY OF 1832 WITH RUSSIA.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations has treated another resolution which I introduced and had referred to the committee with the same inaction and inattention, so far as I know. On the 10th of April I reintroduced a resolution on the subject of the treaty between this country and Russia of 1832 which I introduced at the last session. After that I addressed a communication to the chairman of the committee calling his attention to the resolution and asking him the privilege of being heard by the committee when the matter was taken up. I had a courteous reply, saying in effect that I would be offered this privilege, but up to this time nothing further has been done, so far as I am advised, with reference to the resolution.

I wish to take advantage of this occasion to say that that resolution was introduced in good faith, that it means what it says, and that I trust I will not be placed in the disagreeable attitude of being compelled to move to discharge the committee from the further consideration of the resolution and bringing it before the Senate.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, in harmony with the remarks just made by the Senator from Texas, on a question that is of vital importance to the American Republic and of infinite importance as well to a great religious sect in our country, I ask permission to read the following editorial from the New York Evening Mail of Friday, June 23, 1911:

THE JEW AND THE FLAG.

It can not be that the cool minds in the Russian Government realize the danger in their attitude toward the American citizen who is a Jew. Can we express it, in all its splendid power that it has here, and not seem to Russia extravagant in language? The root idea of this Republic is absolute equality before the law. There is no other doctrine, in all our constitutional concept, that is comparable with this one doctrine. It is our life nerve. It is our very heartbeat.

Therefore the flag protects every law-abiding American the wide world over. The flag knows no Jew. It only knows the American citizen. The flag never reasons beyond that. Is he an American citizen? On every sea, as on every home village green, the flag means the same. Are we understood?

To understand us is a momentous thing. To understand us means taking account of our national spirit, of which it may not become us to boast. Yet the world pretty well understands it now—except possibly Russia. To understand us one needs to count our resources of

every kind which are pledged to the maintenance of our national doctrine to the last.

In other words, we indignantly, not to say angrily, protest against Russia's distinction as to religious belief between American citizens. Such distinction we do not ourselves make at the ballot box. Nor will we brook it made wherever our American citizen travels under the flag.

The flag was carried by Jews on many a bloody field. But we did not know them as Jews. These soldiers of our cause were more. They were our brothers. There was a wide and varied brotherhood. The consecration seemed to rise higher than church steeples, higher than incense from any altar. It was the American spirit, like the sky over us. And, like the eternal sky, it lives.

Quite likely our language will seem the utterance of excitement. On the contrary, it is the coldest possible. It may be necessary for that great nation, whose friendship we have always had, to look us anew in the face and read us. While the Republic lives it recoils, as from a snake, at the sight of anything contrary to absolute equality of rights and freedom of conscience among us of about us, before the law, under the flag.

I respectfully ask that this editorial may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Having been read, it will appear in the RECORD.

GOVERNMENT OF PORTUGAL.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations I wish to say a few words in reply to the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON], but of course I yield to the chairman if he desires to be heard.

Mr. CULLOM. I wish to say only a word.

Mr. BACON. I will wait until the Senator has finished. He is entitled to precedence.

Mr. CULLOM. No; go ahead.

Mr. BACON. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations I desire, with all due deference, to say that I do not recognize that the Senator from Texas has any cause for the grievance which he presents to the Senate or that there is any foundation for it.

The Senator is in error when he says that his resolution received no attention on the part of the committee. It received very careful attention and very careful consideration. The committee proceeded in a way which it thought was the proper way, and which I as an humble member of that committee think was the proper way, and which I am certain the Senate will think was the proper way.

The situation was a somewhat unusual one. It was not the case of a question whether or not the independence of a country should be recognized. That is a very much more radical question than the question as to whether or not the constituted government, or rather one claiming to be a constituted government, shall be recognized as the legitimate and permanent government of a country.

The Republic of Portugal never, up to the time of the introduction of the resolution of the Senator from Texas, and never, so far as I know, up to this time, accredited any representative to this Government. At the time of the occurrence of the revolution in Portugal there was an accredited representative of the Government of Portugal, sent here by the government which was overthrown by the revolution.

He appeared here at this post as the representative of that country. He came here as the representative of the monarchical government which had been overthrown. He remained here after the government was overthrown and was only recognized by the temporary republican government which succeeded the monarchy so far as to send dispatches and official communications from Portugal to the Government of the United States. In other words, holding the credentials of the monarchical government he was recognized by the new government only to the extent of being used as the medium for such diplomatic interchanges as were required.

Now, Mr. President, the committee thought—and, I think, properly thought—that until the Republic of Portugal itself accredited a representative to this Government it was not incumbent upon this Government to take any action upon the question as to whether or not the new government should be recognized as a constituent government, permanent in its nature, and one with which, as such, diplomatic relations should be technically and formally established.

Diplomatic relations were continued with the Government in the way in which I have mentioned. We had a minister there, and since the overthrow of the monarchy, we had appointed, by the President, after he was confirmed by the Senate, a minister to Portugal. It so happens that in the appointment of a minister to that country it is not necessary nor is it the form to credit him to any particular government, monarchical or republican, but he is accredited to that Government, and Mr. Boutelle, who has since been transferred, was appointed. Am I correct in that?

Mr. CULLOM. He was transferred to Switzerland.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Boutelle was nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate as the minister to Portugal, and he was commissioned and has since been transferred to Switzerland.

I simply mention this to show that there was no break whatever in the diplomatic relations of this country, and there was the informality growing out of the fact which I have mentioned, that the Government of Portugal itself recognized the government which the resolution of the Senator from Texas referred to as a temporary government. It had provided for the election of a constituent assembly, which was to determine upon the permanent form of the government and to elect permanent officers of that government.

At the time the Senator from Texas introduced his resolution there was no permanent government in Portugal claimed even by the Portuguese themselves. On the contrary, the Portuguese themselves announced to the world that they had a temporary government, and that they intended to form a permanent government when an election which had been ordered by them had been had and an assembly convened in accordance therewith. That election has been had since the resolution offered by the Senator from Texas, and that constituent assembly has assembled since the resolution offered by the Senator from Texas, and that constituent assembly has since that time elected permanent officers, and since that time the President of the United States has formally, so soon as the Government of Portugal itself claimed that it was permanent, so soon as it said to the world "We have established a permanent government and have elected permanent officers"—so soon as that was done the President of the United States formally recognized that permanent government and those permanent officers.

Now, Mr. President, while that was going on the committee had before it the resolution of the Senator from Texas. We were not indifferent to the resolution. We were not inattentive to the resolution. We were engaged in a proper, legitimate, and necessary investigation as to the facts. An investigation we properly made through the medium of the State Department. Pending that time a letter was had from the State Department setting forth substantially the facts which I have endeavored to recite, and that letter was shown to the Senator from Texas, and, if I remember rightly, it was not only so done, but, when the Senator from Texas again called attention to the fact, the Senator from New York [Mr. Root], who had been deputized by the committee to communicate with the State Department, offered that letter to the Senate and it was read from the desk. Am I correct in that?

Mr. CULLOM. That is right.

Mr. BACON. So, Mr. President, it seems to me to be a statement which can not really be defended that the Foreign Relations Committee failed to give attention to this matter. It not only gave attention to it, but I think gave it exactly the attention which should be given. It was not proper from the viewpoint of the committee, and I will say from the view that I took as an humble member of that committee, that in that condition of affairs the Senate should take a position that, before the Government of Portugal itself claimed that it had elected permanent officers, and before the Government of Portugal had itself sent us the accredited representative, we should insist that we should say to the people of Portugal, "You do not understand your business. You ought before this time to have organized a permanent government, and we, in view of the fact that you are going to be a republic, and you claim now to be a temporary republic, are impatient in this matter, and we insist that you permit us to recognize you as a permanent government when you do not yourselves claim to be such."

Now, I have but one other word to say in regard to the matter, Mr. President. If the Senator from Texas was dissatisfied with the act of the executive department the remedy was within his own reach. If the Senator from Texas was dissatisfied with the action of the Foreign Relations Committee the remedy was within his own reach as a Senator, not, as suggested to him, by a motion to discharge the committee, though, of course, that it was his province to do if he saw fit so to do, but the right to recognize a foreign Government is not exclusively with the executive department. That is a question which has been threshed out in the Senate a good many times; it has had Executive consideration. Away back from the time of Andrew Jackson, and in subsequent administrations, the right has been conceded by the executive department, and has always been claimed by the legislative department, if it saw fit, to recognize a government.

We have done so repeatedly, and could have done so again. Therefore, if the executive department was halting and failing to do its duty in recognition of this temporary government—a government itself only claiming to be temporary—if the

Senate thought that the President was at fault in the matter, it was competent for the Senate itself to adopt a resolution and send it to the House of Representatives recognizing the Republic of Portugal, and it was equally within the right and province of the Senator from Texas to introduce a resolution to that effect.

Mr. President, I want to submit to the Senate whether or not the orderly procedure had not been the one which has led to the orderly result which all of us would have desired? There was a representative of the Government of Portugal here, through whom we were having diplomatic relations with Portugal, not accredited, it is true, by the republican government of Portugal, but recognized by that Government as the representative of that country, as I have previously stated, to the extent of sending dispatches and communications through him. We were not, by reason of the failure to anticipate the action of the Portuguese temporary government, interfering in any manner with any of our business or political or diplomatic relations; and by simply waiting the own good time of Portugal the time has come when Portugal has itself done what the world expected it to do, what we all wanted it to do, and what we are all gratified has been done, to wit, out of the revolution from which sprung this temporary government there has now grown, through the orderly processes of an election by the people and the assembling of the constituent assembly, the creation of a permanent republican government, with permanent republican officers; and doubtless within a short time either the present representative of that country, who was formerly accredited by the monarchical government, will receive new credentials from the new government and present them to the President, or some other man will be charged with that commission by the republican Government of Portugal. In the meantime our own representative is there fully accredited to that Government, whether it be a monarchical government or a republican government.

So, I think, Mr. President, the Senator from Texas does injustice to the Committee on Foreign Relations in the suggestion that there has been any want of attention to the resolution referred by him to that committee; that there has been any disposition to fail to acquaint him personally with what was being done by that committee and the attitude which it occupied, and that it had disregarded the mandate of the Senate through a resolution introduced by the honorable Senator.

Mr. President, as to the other matter, I do not desire to have anything particular to say on that subject. I presume that other members of the committee probably will be heard upon it. I simply desire to say that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE] are no more thoroughly in earnest in the desire that the injustice done to the Jews by Russia shall be corrected than I am; and I know the committee is giving the matter the most serious and careful attention. These are not matters to be done hastily and hurriedly, without due reference to all the consequences which may follow. We know the fact that the treaty to which the resolution refers is the only treaty we have with Russia, and we desire to correct the evil; but we desire to correct it in such a way as not, while we serve one interest, to sacrifice all others. In due time and in good time it is the purpose of the Foreign Relations Committee, and the purpose of the Senate, and the purpose of this Government to carry out the purposes which are had in view by the resolution offered by the Senator from Texas and by the article read by the Senator from New Jersey. I will not go into detail as to that matter further than to say that it is a matter of the utmost gravity. I can not better illustrate or indicate its gravity than by the suggestion that while we seek to serve one interest we must not destroy others. And there are vast interests involved. I am in favor of proceeding in as effective a way as possible and proceeding as speedily as possible. But these things can not be done in a day, or a week, or a month; they are matters which necessarily proceed slowly, and must proceed with caution and care and with the utmost regard for the general interest as well as for the particular interest which it is sought to serve.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President, I have not much to say further than to confirm what the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] has said in reference to the affairs in Portugal. Those affairs have worked out satisfactorily, as we expected them to do, without any noise or fuss about them in the Senate or elsewhere.

As to the other question to which the Senator from Texas has referred, I want to say that we have not neglected that subject. It has been a source of very considerable interest on my part, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations and of the committee as well. It has only been a question as to

what we could safely do and what we have a right to do in the premises without doing, as the Senator from Georgia says, more harm than good.

I wish to say further to the Senator from Texas that I have conferred two or three times with the Secretary of State upon the question. For a time we thought we were going to get the matter settled without any trouble at all, but it seems to have broken out afresh. I do not know what we shall finally do, but I consulted with the Secretary of State only two or three days since in regard to the subject. He is using his best endeavors to do what he knows is to the interest of our own country and of the people who are affected. If the Senator from Texas will only be patient a little while longer, we hope we shall be able to make a report on the question which will be satisfactory to him and to everybody else. The truth is it is a question whether the people concerned in this treaty would not be affected injuriously if we are precipitate about what we do.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] evidently misapprehended what I said, or he fell into some mistake with reference to my attitude. I did not suggest that the Committee on Foreign Relations ought in the future to be discharged from the further consideration of the Portugal resolution; but I had reference in my statement in that respect to the resolution introduced on the subject of the treaty with Russia of 1832. The Senator is mistaken in supposing also—

Mr. BACON. I will say to the Senator from Texas, before he proceeds, that I did not misunderstand him as to the matter he has just mentioned.

Mr. CULBERSON. Very well; let it go then at that.

The Senator misapprehends also the purport, as I think, of the resolution which I introduced and which has been pending in committee since the 6th day of April of this year. I did not propose that the Senate should undertake, by a simple resolution or a concurrent resolution, to recognize the establishment of a Republic in Portugal; but it was a resolution asking for information from the President, if not incompatible with the public interest, with reference to the establishment of the new government in Portugal.

I yield, of course, to the more familiar knowledge of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] with reference to foreign affairs; but, Mr. President, this resolution was drawn with some care, if I do say so, and it sought to secure from the President information upon which subsequently the Senate and the House of Representatives conjointly, if need be, could act with reference to this matter. Notwithstanding the information, superior to mine, which is possessed by the Senator from Georgia with reference to foreign affairs, I undertake to state that the best precedents of this Government are to recognize provisional governments of republics established in foreign countries and not to wait for the establishment of permanent governments. Now, let me read the resolution as to Portugal:

Resolved, That the President be, and he is hereby, requested, if not incompatible with the public interests, to inform the Senate whether the Republic so established has in operation a civil government capable of performing the duties and fulfilling the obligations of an independent power; and if so, whether the Republic has been officially and fully recognized by the executive department of the United States.

Manifestly, Mr. President, the only object of the resolution was to secure definite, distinct, and reliable information for the use of the Senate in any action which it might be proper to take thereafter; but, instead of reporting one way or the other the resolution asking for information, the committee has had it in its possession since the 6th day of April, and, so far as I know, with the exception of the letter which the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOR] allowed me to read, nothing has been done with reference to the particular resolution which I introduced, which was not to declare a recognition on the part of the Senate or in connection with the House of Representatives of the existence of the Republic, but was to secure information upon which the Senate might, if it should see proper, act hereafter. I repeat that, in my opinion, the committee has taken entirely too long a time to answer a resolution of the Senate with reference to this information.

Mr. President, so much for the resolution on the subject of Portugal. With reference to the other resolution, the one as to the treaty of 1832 with Russia, I want to say that I introduced a similar resolution at the regular session—some time in March, I believe, but the date is not material; at all events it was at the last session—and I reintroduced it at this session, and accompanied the resolution, as I have heretofore said, with a letter to the honorable chairman of the committee, stating that when the committee saw proper to take up the resolution for consideration I should like to be heard in committee upon it.

Mr. CULLOM. Will the Senator allow me to say a word?
The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. CULBERSON. Yes.

Mr. CULLOM. I desire to say that when the resolution is taken up for formal consideration by the committee I shall do what I said I would do—that is, inform the Senator so that he can be heard before the committee.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the committee answered me very civilly and courteously in reply to my letter, that when that resolution was taken up for consideration by the committee he would notify me, and that I would have the privilege of appearing before the committee. Not having heard further from it, and seeing from the newspapers the subterfuge by which Russia undertakes to postpone action by this Government on the subject, I had a right, in view of the assurance of the distinguished chairman of the committee, to suppose that the committee had not taken it up for consideration.

I repeat what I said a moment ago—that it is a bona fide resolution. It intends what it purports to do, and I should regret exceedingly to be placed in the disagreeable attitude of being compelled, whatever may be the result of my efforts, to see that this resolution has attention on the part of the committee, and, if necessary, on the part of the Senate.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I do not desire to repeat what I have already said—I think it is an answer practically to what the Senator has said in rejoinder—further than to call attention to the fact that the letter was not, as stated by the Senator from Texas, simply shown to him, but that the Senate had the full benefit of that letter, that it was read from the desk, and while I have, in probably a more diffuse way than would be justifiable, endeavored to state it, that letter did substantially set forth all the facts I have stated here, and particularly as to the facts that it was a temporary government; that it itself had never accredited any representative to this Government; that the people of Portugal were proceeding to form a permanent government; that that was expected soon to be accomplished; and, when accomplished, this Government would act as it has done.

Of course, Mr. President, nobody will for a moment suggest that the Senator from Texas had any other than serious motives in the introduction of the resolution. The Senator is recognized as a serious Senator; he introduces a great many resolutions; and we all recognize that all of them are with serious intent and entitled to the utmost consideration. The committee has never regarded the Senator's two resolutions in any other light than as extremely serious matters, and has given them the careful and deliberate attention and consideration which they merit on account of what they themselves express and on account of their very distinguished authorship.

HEARINGS ON RECIPROCITY BILL.

Mr. SMOOT. From the Committee on Finance I present hearings held before that committee on House bill 4412, known as the reciprocity bill, and also hearings on House bill 4413, known as the farmers' free-list bill. I ask that these hearings, arranged by subjects, be printed as separate Senate documents. (S. Docs. Nos. 56 and 58.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I want to inquire whether or not the index of the testimony taken at the hearings is complete. I have received a copy with an index showing only the names of those who appeared and the dates, but no such index as we have heretofore had is attached to it. Before those hearings are printed permanently they should be indexed.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in the hearings that I have presented here and asked to have printed as a public document everything is arranged by subjects matter. Every subject is arranged by itself, and everything said upon that subject is under that head; so that if you want to refer to any one particular subject it is there. The index, of course, shows who spoke upon that particular subject and the page of the hearings where it will be found.

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes; but reference to subjects matter seems to me lacking in the index.

Mr. SMOOT. We have arranged it differently in the hearings which I have presented. It is now arranged so that every subject matter is by itself.

Mr. HEYBURN. That is all right. I was speaking with reference to a copy that was sent to my room.

Mr. SMOOT. Those were daily hearings, and what the Senator has said is true of the daily hearings; but these have been rearranged.

Mr. HEYBURN. It is quite important that they should have a carefully prepared index. Heretofore they have been indexed in a very excellent manner.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I should like to state, for the information of the Senator from Idaho that copies of the hearings which have been in the possession of Senators are the first, second, and third prints of the document. Very great pains have been taken, however, to make the final print entirely accurate as regards the figures and statistics and the testimony of the more than 100 persons who were heard by the committee. In every case the testimony has been sent to the witness, with the request that he correct it. The index in this final print is not as thorough or as exhaustive as would ordinarily be made, but it is as much in detail as is practicable in view of the fact that it is so desirable to have these hearings out promptly for the use of Senators during the discussion of this question.

Mr. HEYBURN. I fully realize that, Mr. President. I have received one volume, so far as my attention has been called to it, of the corrected print. Now, I want to say in connection with that matter that, in my judgment, it is not profitable nor in the interest of accuracy that men should be given an opportunity to convert into an essay testimony that is obtained under the fire of examination, direct or cross. All lawyers have had experience with that matter, and it has been found utterly unwise to submit testimony to witnesses for their correction. The result is that you get an essay in lieu of the result of that class of examination that tests a man's veracity and his intelligence.

Mr. PENROSE. Very great care was taken by the editors of this publication that the testimony should not be altered into the essay character which the Senator apprehends. It is substantially the same. But on several days the confusion was so great, the number of witnesses so great, that very many errors crept in which it was very desirable and important to correct. These hearings are extremely valuable and cover a wide range of agricultural topics and will be found most useful to Members of the Senate in the discussion of this question.

ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE FOR COLORADO.

Mr. CUMMINS (for Mr. CLARK of Wyoming), from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 77) to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge in and for the district of Colorado, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 91) thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LIPPITT:

A bill (S. 2915) granting an increase of pension to Sarah B. Potter;

A bill (S. 2916) granting an increase of pension to Amelia A. Baab;

A bill (S. 2917) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Hill; and

A bill (S. 2918) granting an increase of pension to Horace P. Lester; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRISTOW:

A bill (S. 2919) granting an increase of pension to William A. Limbocker (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2920) granting an increase of pension to Thomas R. H. Simmons (with accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 2921) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Cason (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CUMMINS:

A bill (S. 2922) to erect a memorial to Gen. Nathaniel Lyon; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. McCUMBER:

A bill (S. 2923) defining the procedure in case of protested or objected final proof on public lands; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 2924) to amend section 646, chapter 18, Code of Laws for the District of Columbia, relating to insurance companies and associations (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

A bill (S. 2925) providing for a Confederate naval monument in the Vicksburg National Military Park; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRANDEGEE:

A bill (S. 2926) granting an increase of pension to Horace P. Tucker; and

A bill (S. 2927) granting an increase of pension to Amelia A. Tracy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRADLEY:

A bill (S. 2928) appropriating money for and directing the purchase of additional land in Cave Hill Cemetery at Louisville, Ky.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2929) granting an increase of pension to John J. Evans (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2930) for the relief of Kentucky drafted men; to the Committee on Claims.

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

Mr. NELSON submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4412) to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

AMENDMENTS TO DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SMOOT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 12109) to supply a deficiency in the appropriations for contingent expenses of the House of Representatives for the fiscal year 1911, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SUTHERLAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 12109) to supply a deficiency in the appropriations for contingent expenses of the House of Representatives for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1911, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BACON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 12109) to supply a deficiency in the appropriations for contingent expenses of the House of Representatives for the fiscal year 1911, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY AND WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION COMMISSION.

Mr. SUTHERLAND submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 6), which was read and referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate and the House of Representatives 5,000 copies of the hearings before the Employers' Liability and Workmen's Compensation Commission, 2,000 copies for the use of the Senate and 3,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

ASSISTANT CLERK TO COMMITTEE ON PATENTS.

Mr. BROWN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 91), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Patents be, and it is hereby, authorized to employ an assistant clerk, at a salary of \$1,440 per annum, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided for by law.

ASSISTANT MESSENGER TO COMMITTEE ON CONTINGENT EXPENSES.

Mr. BRIGGS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 92), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate is hereby authorized to employ an assistant messenger, at a salary of \$1,000 per annum, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided for by law.

ASSISTANT CLERK TO COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HEALTH.

Mr. CULBERSON. I offer a Senate resolution and ask that it be read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 93) was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, That the salary of the assistant clerk of the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided by law, shall be \$2,000 per annum.

POWER PRIVILEGES AT GOVERNMENT DAMS.

Mr. BURTON. I present a paper, being a memorandum, prepared by the War Department, of the acts of Congress concerning power privileges at Government dams. I move that the memorandum be printed as a Senate document. (S. Doc. No. 57.)

The motion was agreed to.

OPERATION OF THE PANAMA CANAL.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I send to the desk a letter and memorandum from the secretary of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, which I ask may be read and referred to the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

THE PHILADELPHIA MARITIME EXCHANGE, Philadelphia, June 26, 1911.

Hon. FRANK D. BRANDEGEE,
Chairman Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

SIR: I have the honor to inclose herewith copy of action recently taken by the executive committee of this exchange in connection with pending legislation regarding the operation of the Panama Canal, and shall esteem it a favor if you will kindly have the same filed with your committee for its future consideration.

Yours, faithfully, E. R. SHARWOOD, Secretary.

PHILADELPHIA MARITIME EXCHANGE.

Concerning the enactment of legislation by the Congress of the United States to provide for the operation of the Panama Canal and to authorize the President to fix canal tolls the executive committee of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, at a meeting held the 12th day of June, 1911, unanimously adopted the following:

Whereas it is practically certain that by the autumn of 1913 the Panama Canal will be near enough to completion to permit it to be used by merchant shipping; and

Whereas steamship companies and others interested in the operation of vessels through the canal will require from 18 months to 2 years to prepare to use the canal, to terminate existing contracts, to provide new facilities, and to secure or build such additional ships as will be required to begin using the canal promptly; and

Whereas companies operating vessels either as common carriers or as large manufacturers and shippers can not definitely decide to prepare to use the canal until they know what tolls are to be charged for the passing through the canal, and thus know whether the canal route will be more economical than other routes: Be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be urgently requested to pass a law at the present special session providing for the operation of the Panama Canal and authorizing the President to fix, within limits established by Congress, the tolls to be charged for the use of the canal by merchant shipping of the United States and of foreign countries.

A true copy.

[SEAL.]

E. R. SHARWOOD, Secretary.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, referring to the matter touched upon in the memorial just read, Col. Goethals, the engineer in charge of the Panama Canal, appeared before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce within a few weeks and stated at length the situation in the Canal Zone and the necessity for quick action upon the subjects mentioned in the memorial.

The situation in the House, if I may refer to it without being unparliamentary, as is well known and has been reported in the press, under the control of the dominant party there, is such, by reason of the caucus action of the dominant party, as I understand it, that there is no intention of taking up general legislation other than certain tariff matters, if I am correctly informed about that. I have made some inquiry of Members of the House, and am informed that there is no prospect of action being had upon this matter in the House at this special session.

I have also had several conferences with the President in relation to this matter, and he, of course, realizes the great importance of action at the earliest possible minute upon this matter. But in view of the present situation in the Senate, with the unfinished business privileged, after a conference with as many of the members of the Senate Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals as I have been able to see, we do not think anything would be gained by attempting legislation in respect to this matter at this special session.

It seems idle for this body, even if it could, in view of the unfinished business, to take up this subject and debate it simply, if debate it requires, as a moot question, if no action whatever can be had in the House. Therefore, in accordance with the consensus of opinion of the committee and upon the assurance of the President that he did not think at this time it was wise for him to ask the Congress to take up this matter, I thought it was due the parties interested in shipbuilding, and those who desire to prepare themselves for the use of the canal, to make the statement that it was not probable that anything could be done at this special session, but that at the very earliest minute, when we reconvene next December, the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals will take up this matter and proceed with it with the greatest possible expedition.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The letter and memorandum will be referred to the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals.

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

Mr. GAMBLE. On Monday morning last I gave notice that I would submit a few observations on the bill (H. R. 4412) to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes. I have been engaged this morning, and will be throughout the day, in connection with a committee, and to-morrow morning after the routine morning business, with the indulgence of the Senate, I shall be glad to address it on the subject.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH.

Mr. WORKS. I desire to give notice that on next Thursday, a week from to-day, immediately following the morning business, I will submit some remarks upon the bill (S. 1) to establish a department of health, and for other purposes.

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

Mr. PENROSE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4412) to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, may I say in beginning this morning that I hope that those Senators who favor this measure, and have believed it ought to pass without any amendment whatsoever, will do me the honor to hear a portion of what I shall have to say before I have finished; not that portion which relates to the merits of the amendments I have offered enlarging the free list so far as the United States is concerned, but to the portion which concerns the form of the proposed arrangement. I will show before I have concluded that no self-respecting nation can admit without qualification the agreement in the exact form in which it has been proposed to us, and that it must be modified if it is to accomplish the purposes which its authors had in view.

Mr. President, I believe that I feel the responsibilities of the position I occupy toward this measure more deeply than those upon the other side of the Chamber who are in favor of a complete reversal of our economic system, and more deeply than those upon this side of the Chamber who have favored the retention of the high duties which I have sought from time to time to reduce.

I believe that our tariff law should be revised. I believe that its duties should be reduced. I believe that many commodities upon which we now levy duties should be transferred to the free list. And believing those things, the injustice of the present arrangement impresses and affects me more deeply, as I think, than it can affect any Senator who desires to substitute some other system for the one we have heretofore adopted, or any Senator who believes that these duties of the protective tariff are what they ought to be.

Mr. President, the one thing that the people of a free country can not and will not endure is a sense of injustice at the hands of its government. We will pass through trials and hardships and poverty and misfortune with cheerful hearts and resolute courage. We do not expect and do not want equality of fortune. There always have been poor people and there always have been rich people, and there always will be poor people and rich people. We do not want to take from one that which he has justly earned in order to give it to another. The people of this country will not lose their abiding faith in free institutions, no matter what adversity may overcome them, until they reach the conclusion that the organized society of which they are members is not dealing fairly with them. Whenever any great part of our population comes to believe that the Government to which they owe their allegiance and the Government of which they are subjects is engaged in a scheme of injustice, then, indeed, will the day have come when we may look for a dissolution of our present relations to each other.

The fair and honest distribution of wealth is the great difficulty of the present time; it is the great problem of the present time. As every thinking, observing man knows, there is now in the minds of a great many of the people of this country a feeling that their Government is not doing what it ought to do to insure every man his opportunity, and is doing some things that it ought not to do, that unfairly affect the distribution of wealth, that we give to one man the profits of the labor of another; and I appeal to you with all the earnestness that can possess a loyal and patriotic heart that we must not intensify this feeling.

What are we to expect will follow the arrangement which is now proposed? I am not asking my Democratic friends to change their minds with regard to the proper kind of a tariff. They believe in a system which will levy duties for the revenues of the Government only. I am not quarreling with that at this time. I do not believe in that system. But it is so much better than the system or disorganized system that would ensue if this bill shall pass in its present form that I would instantly yield in submission to the revenue system rather than have such an one as will result if this bill passes without amelioration or modification.

Mark me, the people of this country, with their unerring judgment and with their high intelligence, will know who is responsible for subjecting the farmers of the country to the perils, whatever perils there are, of a free market in which to sell and

holding them at the same time in the manacles of a protected market in which to buy.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHIVELY in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I hold in my hand what purports to be an inaugural address of the Senator from Iowa, delivered when he was governor of the State of Iowa, on January 14, 1904, and there are a few words on page 9 of this pamphlet containing the alleged address which it strikes me are peculiarly pertinent to what the Senator from Iowa has just said. Would he yield long enough for me to read them?

Mr. CUMMINS. Gladly. I remember them very well, but I am very glad that other Senators here should know what they are.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I was afraid the Senator had forgotten the concluding sentence of what I shall read.

Mr. CUMMINS. I can assure the Senator from Mississippi upon that point. I remember it very distinctly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Upon that occasion the Senator from Iowa, then governor of that great State, said:

Let us not be content with mere abstractions. It has been possible to make, and in my judgment it is still possible to make, a treaty with Canada which would for years to come make us practically masters of the imports into that Dominion. In the last 10 years American manufacturers have expended \$100,000,000 in the establishment of plants in Canada which would have been kept at home, with all the labor which that implies, if there had been a fair and permanent relation existing between the two countries. Not only so, but every student of affairs knows that the chance we now have across the border will be completely destroyed unless we treat with our neighbors upon a fair reciprocal basis. The farmers of Iowa have lost something in the foreclosure of the opportunity to feed the men who are operating the plants to which I have referred, and they will lose more when Canada raises the barrier so that England, France, and Germany will supply the material for the wonderful development upon which she is just entering and which we are so well prepared to supply. It has been said that in order to obtain these changes it will be necessary for us to let into our markets Canada's agricultural products or some of them. I believe this to be partially true; but let me ask the farmers of Iowa whether they think they would lose in the exchange? Which would you rather do, lose the market which would be created by our vast imports into Canada or meet Canada in competition in the things which you produce? I assert confidently that in the sharp struggle with Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, the Dakotas, Nebraska, Kansas, and Missouri—

Mr. CUMMINS. Why does the Senator pause?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Wait a minute. I pause that the words may sink into or, rather, revive the Senator's memory. Now, I continue to read from the Senator's speech:

I assert confidently that in the sharp struggle with Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and the Dakotas, Nebraska, Kansas, and Missouri you would never be able to discern the influence of Canada in corn, oats, barley, hay, cattle, horses, hogs, butter, and eggs.

Mr. CUMMINS. Has the Senator from Mississippi now concluded all that he desires to read from the address?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is all.

Mr. CUMMINS. There is a great deal of good material following that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am perfectly willing to read further.

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not ask the Senator to read it, but I commend it to him.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The reason why I read that part of it was because it is peculiarly relevant to almost the last sentence uttered by the Senator from Iowa before I read it; because if he thought, as I understood him a moment ago to say, that the admission of Canadian agricultural products was so unfair to our farmers that he would be willing to do almost anything to prevent this bill passing—

Mr. CUMMINS. Does the Senator from Mississippi observe any inconsistency between the statement he has read and anything I have said here at this time?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Mississippi would not be discourteous enough to charge any Senator with inconsistency, because that is peculiarly the virtue of people of our calling—politicians. But the last line of his speech when governor, in which the Senator from Iowa asserts—and does not assert hesitatingly, but "confidently"—that in the struggle—and not merely an ordinary struggle, but in the "sharp struggle" between the farmers in these various American States, including his own—"the Iowa farmer would never be able to discern the influence" of Canada, whence was to come the importation of all the designated Canadian agricultural products, struck me in such a way that had I made that speech and the speech which the Senator from Iowa now makes, I would have been disposed to suspect that perhaps I had been guilty of some inconsistency.

Mr. CUMMINS. Ah, Mr. President, the wit of the Senator from Mississippi is charming and delightful, as it always is, but I hope now that he has read the sentence, or the few

sentences, from an address of mine he will listen a moment further to the development of the subject and will not forsake the Chamber for the cool retreats of the smoking room.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I hope the Senator from Iowa has noticed that except when I am absolutely forced to do so I never desert the Chamber while he is speaking.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Mississippi does me altogether too much credit. I have not had the honor to speak in the presence of the Senator from Mississippi until yesterday, and then he was chiefly conspicuous by his absence.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the Senator is mistaken about that. I may have been in another seat than my own.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi if he desires to be further heard.

Mr. CUMMINS resumed.

In my opinion, Mr. President, 10 years ago or 7 years ago there was no fear to be apprehended from the free admission of agricultural products.

And mark you, I am not standing here contending now against the free admission of agricultural products from Canada. It is the Senator from Mississippi who is inconsistent, not the Senator from Iowa. I am simply asking that when you admit the products of Canada free in competition with the farmer you admit also some of the manufactures free from Canada; and the Senator from Mississippi insists that none of these manufactures shall enter the United States free from Canada unless they enter under a separate and independent measure, the passage of which is to be long deferred and very uncertain at any time.

I am not addressing the Senate at this time for the purpose of holding duties upon agricultural products. I am addressing it for the purpose of awakening, if I can, some little sense of justice in the souls of the people here, so that when this free competition comes it shall be accompanied by a free market in which to buy. Ten years ago or seven years ago there was no difference between the prices of the main agricultural products in Canada and the United States.

Seven years ago we were absolutely upon an export basis. Our surplus was so large in comparison with our consumption that we took the export price just as Canada does now. We have gradually, however, neared the point when the duties upon certain products do increase the price. Still I am not asking that they shall be retained. I am simply asking the plainest and the commonest justice, that when the farmer must enter into free and unlimited competition in respect to what he sells he shall have the same competition with regard to what he buys.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I hope the Senator from Iowa understands that in the last sentence he has expressed an opinion in which I heartily concur. The only difference between the Senator from Iowa and myself seems to me to be that while he thinks he can, in the Congress of the United States, ingraft upon an agreement with Canada a bargain which it requires two parties to make, something to which the other side has not agreed, I do not. But whenever the time shall come for the admission of manufactured products from Canada at a revenue rate, or free, a great many of them, I shall be found cooperating with the Senator from Iowa much more than people upon his own side of the Chamber.

Mr. CUMMINS. That is simply to—

Keep the promise to the ear
And break it to the hope.

We have made no agreement with Canada. There is no agreement with Canada, and the Senator from Mississippi does not know what Canada will accept or what Canada will reject. It is for the Senate of the United States just now to make such proposition to Canada as it believes is for the welfare of its own people and in justice to a friendly neighbor to the north. We can not cloak ourselves with the delusion that there has been any agreement made with Canada or any arrangement made with that country. It is our business to make an agreement with Canada, if we desire that one shall be made. Neither the President of the United States nor the State Department has the power to make any proposal to Canada or receive any proposal from Canada which touches a change in the tariff duties ordained and established by Congress. Congress alone has the power or the authority under the Constitution to determine what our duties shall be against any country, and the

House of Representatives alone has the power to originate such a measure.

Suppose that no Member had been found willing to introduce a bill into the House of Representatives touching this subject, does the Senator from Mississippi think that it could have been brought to the attention of Congress at all? Could it have been sent here in the form of a treaty to be ratified by the Senate with two-thirds majority in order to become the supreme law of the land?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In answer to that question I shall ask the Senator from Iowa another. Is he not aware of the fact that there have been negotiated half a dozen or more treaties between the United States and other countries which did affect import duties, beginning with the Jay treaty in George Washington's administration and the treaty with Prussia negotiated by Thomas Jefferson, and coming on down?

Mr. CUMMINS. I know, Mr. President, that there was a time when it was done, but since the far-famed and unfortunate enterprise with Canada in 1854 there has not been any treaty made with any country upon the face of the earth by which or through which it was attempted to change the tariff duties of the United States without the authority of Congress. I think there is one exception to the statement that I have made. It was a treaty entered into or projected between the United States and Mexico and possibly, as I remember it, negotiated by that distinguished leader, Ulysses S. Grant. But with that exception I know of no attempt on the part of the executive department of the United States to negotiate a treaty by which duties were changed without the previous authority of the Congress of the United States, including, of course, the House of Representatives.

I entirely deny the power of the President to negotiate a treaty touching a subject of which Congress has exclusive jurisdiction.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield further to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. By way of prefatory remark, I will say that, of course, this is not an attempt on the part of the President of the United States to effect this purpose by a treaty, but is in fact a presidential recommendation that Congress put into legislative shape a tentative agreement of the two countries. But going back to what we were talking about, the Senator from Iowa has said that since 1854 there has been no treaty made involving duties on imports—

Mr. CUMMINS. Save one that I now remember.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, we will leave the Mexican incident out—no treaty made which affects import duties since the Canadian reciprocity treaty of 1854.

Mr. CUMMINS. Which changed them.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Which changed them. I mean which involved them by changing them, raising or lowering them. Accepting that statement as a fact, is not this true, first, and is not this true, second: First, since that time the reason why no treaty of that sort had been entered into was because this Government had been under the domination of the high protectionists of the country, who did not want any treaties of that sort entered into; whose Executives have been protectionists, and therefore have not attempted to lower the tariff in any way? That is the first question. The second question is, Does the Senator not think that George Washington and Jay and Madison, the men who formed the administration, and the two Houses of Congress under George Washington's administration, many of whom had been concerned in the construction and formation of the Constitution itself, knew just about as much about the Constitution and what was intended by it as do we?

Mr. CUMMINS. Probably more; but I can only read the Constitution, and I try to understand the English language.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the Senator not think that the fact that the Jay treaty, which was negotiated in the lifetime of the men who framed the Constitution and under the Presidency of the man who was president of the Constitutional Convention, did affect import duties is rather persuasive authority?

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Mississippi would have to produce the treaties; I do not deny that they are in existence; but, in order that we might conduct this argument with intelligence, he must produce those treaties in order that we may consider their terms. There is not a single one of them, as I remember, which concerns itself solely with import

duties—not one. They all embrace matters which are and conceded were within the jurisdiction of the treaty-making authority.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That statement, to wit, that those treaties did not concern themselves solely with import duties, is correct; but if the President and the Senate have no right by treaty to enter into an agreement whereby import duties and nothing else are affected, where the sole effect of the treaty is to affect import duties, then, logically, certainly they have no right to enter into a treaty where a part of the treaty affects import duties. If they have authority to lower or raise by treaty a single duty they have equal constitutional warrant to raise or lower a thousand.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield to me for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. NELSON. I want to call the attention of the Senator from Iowa to the fact that this bill contains on this subject a plea of confession and avoidance. Section 3 expressly gives the President authority that he has never had before. If he had the authority, which is contended for, to negotiate such treaties, what is the necessity of putting it into this bill? If there is no objection, I will read section 3. That section provides:

That for the purpose of further readjusting the duties on importations into the United States of article or articles the growth, product, or manufacture of the Dominion of Canada, and of the exportation into the Dominion of Canada of article or articles the growth, product, or manufacture of the United States, the President of the United States is authorized and requested to negotiate trade agreements with the Dominion of Canada wherein mutual concessions are made looking toward freer trade relations and the further reciprocal expansion of trade and commerce.

If the President has this authority, then what is the necessity, I repeat, of putting it into this bill? Is it not, as I have said, a plea of confession and avoidance?

Mr. CUMMINS. I understand, Mr. President, that that is a question propounded to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], who seems to be on the point of vanishing. I await with some impatience his return. [A pause.] Having now the attention of the Senator from Mississippi, I repeat that the inquiry of the Senator from Minnesota seemed to be propounded to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Just at that point I received a note from the Marble Room, and was reading it, so I did not hear what the Senator from Minnesota said.

Mr. CUMMINS. I was quite sure the Senator from Mississippi would not last; that he would fall upon his inferential promise that he would remain until this discussion had been finished, at least upon the question of constitutional power.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I assure the Senator from Iowa that I was very much worried by receiving a note asking me to step out to see a gentleman in the lobby for a minute. I so much regretted to miss the eloquence of the Senator from Minnesota and any additional eloquence of the Senator from Iowa that I had wished that the gentleman who sent for me had come at any other time; but while busy reading the note, I did not hear what the Senator from Minnesota said. It is my loss that I did not.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, there are coincidences that are providential, and I accept this as one of them. I was about, however, to recur to the matter of consistency and to the conditions of 1894 as compared with the conditions of 1911. In the extract which the Senator from Mississippi was good enough to read from an address of mine, he will remember that I stated in it that reciprocity with Canada involved such concessions on the part of Canada, such a disposition upon the part of Canada, as would give to the United States a mastery of her market for the sale of manufactured products. Why, Mr. President, I not only advocated reciprocity in the address to which the Senator has referred, but I advocated it all over the United States. I spoke for it from the Atlantic to the Pacific. I believed in it, and I still believe in it; but I never dreamed that the friends of reciprocity would advance such a measure as we are now considering as the fulfillment of my hope that we might draw nearer to this neighbor of ours upon the north. I thought by admitting Canada upon fair terms to our market with her natural products, that Canada would admit us—that seemed to be her disposition then—to her market upon as good or better terms than she admitted any other nation for our manufactured products; but these seven years have revolutionized conditions. Canada does not admit us to her market for our manufactures upon better terms than she admits other nations. On the contrary, with few exceptions she does not, she has not in the past, and does not propose in the

future to admit us upon as good terms as she admits other nations of the world. If we are to conquer that market we must do it against the unfair competition of her mother country, as well as against the unfair competition of France and Germany, with which nations she has recently entered into reciprocal treaties or agreements.

Mr. President, the bargain that possibly we could have made with Canada in 1898, in 1900, in 1902, and 1904 is no longer possible. Canada has entirely changed her ambition and her industrial form in these years. The national spirit has been so developed, the national ambition has been so stimulated that she intends to be not a subordinate of the United States, but a rival of the United States, not only in agricultural products, but in manufactured products as well. I do not decry the new spirit so manifest in Canada. I applaud the loyalty and the patriotism of the people of that country in changing the course which seemed to be popular in the years that have gone.

I may say here that no friend of this treaty discovers a greater necessity for friendly relations with Canada than do I. I believe that it ought to be one of the high and persistent purposes of the United States to cultivate friendly feelings with its neighbor upon the north, that lives and will live under practically the same conditions that surround us; but we might as well accept the conclusion that Canada, with her tremendous possibilities, is to be a rival of the United States, and I hope that the rivalry will go forward with all the friendly and gracious feeling that ought to animate the people who are so joined together in tradition and proximity.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I understood the Senator from Iowa to say that Canada had been disposed to discriminate against the United States in trade relations in favor of the mother country?

Mr. CUMMINS. She has discriminated.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. As I recall the statistics of trade, Canada has during the recent past purchased from the United States more than twice the amount the United States has purchased from Canada. Does the Senator from Iowa think that is showing a disposition not to patronize the United States?

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Nebraska, Mr. President, can not possibly confuse the volume of trade with the fact of discrimination. The Senator from Nebraska knows that at the present time upon everything, or substantially everything, Canada admits imports from Great Britain at a less rate of duty than she admits the same imports from the United States.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Possibly, but the fact is—

Mr. CUMMINS. Not possibly, but in fact. Now, if the United States has been able, notwithstanding that discrimination, to sell to the people of Canada more than Great Britain can sell her, so much to the credit, honor, and enterprise of the producers of the United States, but it does not alter the fact of discrimination.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is true not only that Canada every year purchases from the United States twice as much as she purchases from Great Britain, but it is also true in a reciprocal sense that Canada purchases twice as much from the United States as the United States purchases from Canada. It seems to me that those two facts indicate that the Canadian policy at least is not such as to prohibit friendly trade relations with the United States, but she appears to us as one of our very best patrons.

Mr. CUMMINS. Unquestionably, Mr. President. I began this speech by saying that we had pursued a policy toward Canada for 50 or 60 years that is utterly indefensible. We have been levying against Canada duties which, on the average and reduced to ad valorem, are the equivalent of 43 or 44 per cent, while Canada during all that time has been levying against our imports into her Dominion duties which were on the average little more than 25 per cent. No man, in view of the circumstances which surround both countries, would be so bold as to defend that course toward Canada. Our duties upon her imports have been so high that she could not supply us with any great volume of commodities; but the fact remains that Canada is discriminating against the United States, and if she did not discriminate against the United States we would take practically all of her market.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator allow me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, with all due respect, I think both Senators are astray on this subject of Canadian exports and imports. For the fiscal year 1910 our exports to Canada

were nearly \$215,000,000, and our imports from Canada were only \$95,000,000, giving us a balance of trade in our favor of \$120,000,000, and the balance of trade has been in that proportion for the last 8 or 10 years. Last year our total exports were \$1,744,000,000. Of this great amount Great Britain absorbed \$505,000,000; Germany, \$249,000,000; and Canada, \$215,000,000. The balance of trade in our favor on the trade with Great Britain was \$234,000,000; with Canada, \$120,000,000; and with Germany only \$80,000,000, showing how immense our trade with Canada is and how our exports to Canada are more than double our imports.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think, Mr. President, that is exactly what was stated both by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and myself. I have before me a consular report issued by the Bureau of Manufactures, and I find in it these statements:

The imports into Canada from the United Kingdom for 1910 were \$107,679,719; from other British territory, \$19,824,795; from the United States, \$270,644,736; from France, \$11,376,879; from Germany, \$8,782,174; and from other countries \$25,496,565, making an aggregate of \$443,000,804.68, of which we exported into Canada \$270,644,736, and in the same period imported from Canada into the United States \$117,145,555.

These results have been accomplished notwithstanding the fact that Canada does give to Great Britain a lower duty upon substantially everything than she gives to the United States; and this bill does not change that, save that it disturbs the relation somewhat. We may get into Canada upon slightly better duties as compared with the duty upon British commodities than we have enjoyed heretofore.

But I care little about the chance of increasing our exports, and you care nothing about it. The Senator from Mississippi cares nothing about it. There is not a Senator here who has his mind fixed upon that phase of this arrangement—not one. It is a negligible quantity, and everybody knows it is a negligible quantity. Our minds are absorbed with just one thought, namely, the relinquishment of our duties upon our imports and the subjection of our farmers to the free competition of Canada. That is the phase of this question which engages our attention. I have not heard a word said heretofore, and do not expect to hear very much said, about the reduction of these duties accomplishing any very great enlargement of our exports into Canada. We are already in possession of her market in manufactured products to a high degree; and if we want to entertain that friendly relation which has been so vaunted here, if we want to draw close to Canada, if we want to add something more to her prosperity, we ought to hope that she will manufacture her own goods under the new departure instead of taking them from the United States.

Let us be consistent with regard to the matter. But referring again to the changed conditions, comparing 10 years ago with the present time, the man is blind who does not see that we can not deal with Canada upon the same terms that we could have dealt with her then. I want her friendship, and I may as well say here, because I understand I have been quoted in that Dominion as being in favor of annexing Canada to the United States, that I am not in favor of annexing Canada to the United States. I am not in favor of annexing Mexico to the United States, or Cuba to the United States, or Porto Rico or the Philippines. Our country is big enough to consume all the energies of the American people in its government. I do not want to add to the severity of our problems by the absorption of other countries, with their different interests and their different ambitions.

I want to put it now, once for all, so that everybody can understand my position at least with regard to it, that I am opposed to any enlargement of the territory of the United States, and I have no doubt the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] could find in some former address of mine, uttered in the spirit of national pride, a hope that the Stars and Stripes might some time float from the North Pole, with not a single sovereignty between its starry folds and the territory of the Republic. But I do not think so now. I am quite convinced that we have here and with us and among us and about us all the problems that are necessary to tax the best minds and the best hearts of the best people upon the face of the earth. And we will do well if we maintain the freedom and the glory and the dignity of the United States without inviting complicating situations in other directions.

Our concern here is, as it seems to me, the admission of a part of the products of Canada free without admitting at the same time another part of the products of Canada free. The Senators upon the other side can only say that we refuse to add these things to the proposition because they will endanger its passage and its approval. Let me remove, if I can, that cloud of fear and apprehension from their minds. Do you think it will render this agreement less satisfactory to Canada if we give

her free admission to our country of her manufactured products, especially the manufactured products of agriculture? Do you think she will decline the agreement because her markets in the United States are widened without any additional burden being put upon her? No man will so assert. Do you believe—I hesitate to speak of this, but it has been mentioned so often that I feel impelled to do it—that the President of the United States would decline to approve this arrangement if we reduced the duties upon or removed the duties from other products coming from Canada into the United States without imposing any new burden upon Canada? Can you imagine any reason that could influence an intelligent mind to take that course?

If you can not, then you are barren of reasons for not admitting these additional articles to the free list. If the chief purpose of this arrangement is to enlarge our markets in Canada, then I can understand that somebody might say that we must not add these things to the free list, but must hold them for future bargain and sale. But that is not our purpose. It is not the purpose of a man in this Chamber. The purpose is to reduce our own duties so as to relieve our own people of some of the taxation which they have sustained, and I can not understand how those who believe in the reduction of duties can successfully go to the people of the United States and declare to them that they willingly missed the only opportunity that they will have at this session of Congress to render this tardy justice.

I put it upon another ground. While I do not believe that at the present time we can admit the agricultural products of Canada free into the United States without harm or injury to the American farmer, as was the case in 1904, yet if we are to do it—and I know we are going to do it—any hope of ameliorating or changing the bill in that respect has long since gone; if we are going to do it, give me some reason why we should not do something for the farmer at the same time that we are taking away the measure of protection which he now has.

As a broad and original proposition, in view of the changed conditions in this country, in view of the revolution in Canada, if I had my way about it I would not enter into any arrangement at all with Canada. I do not believe it is wise to enter into any arrangement with Canada. We can do her full justice without any agreement upon her part. If I could have my way about it, I would take this tariff from the beginning to the end, and I would put upon every competitive article just that duty which would measure the difference between the cost of producing it here and elsewhere. I understand perfectly that the application of that doctrine would affect a large part of the duties now imposed upon agricultural products. It would preserve some of the duties to some degree. And so long as we maintain the doctrine of protection, so long the farmers are entitled to the application of the rule without discrimination.

I have heard it said, too, that I was inconsistent, and I remember, as the Senator from Mississippi so beautifully said, consistency is thought to be a jewel. I do not think it is. It is not comparable with an honest faith, an honest conviction.

Allow me to suggest that one very distinguished authority—I will not name him, because the Senator from Mississippi will remember him and he will be able to correct this quotation, because I am conscious that I may not give it with accuracy. But he said something like this: That consistency is the hobgoblin of small men and mean minds.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is a small matter, but I should dislike to have it go to the country that I said "consistency is a jewel," although, I believe, Shakespeare did say it. I said "it was the virtue of men of our calling, politicians," and so far as I know no other sensible class of men anywhere else in the world regard consistency as above being right. My own opinion is that a man ought to change his utterance whenever he changes his opinion, and he ought to change his opinions whenever he finds good reason to change them.

Mr. CUMMINS. I believe so. I believe the Senator from Mississippi has stated the truth of the matter with his usual felicity. I wish I could change mine oftener than I do. There is a pride of opinion that sometimes holds a man fast, long after the basis of his belief has disappeared.

I am not conscious, however, of any change in my opinion concerning this subject. I do not perceive any difference between the justice I asked in 1904 and the justice I ask now. I would make the protective doctrine an easy master instead of a hard master, as it is now. I would take up the schedules one at a time, and I am perfectly willing to take up the agricultural schedule first, and I believe the farmers of the United States are willing that their schedule shall be taken up first. And if in applying the Republican doctrine there is found no difference

between the cost of production elsewhere and here, then I know they would cheerfully submit to the removal of the duties which affect their products.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa one question. He has a moment ago announced his adherence to the latest Republican doctrine of protection, to wit, that the rates ought to be "equal to the difference between the cost of production" here and abroad. I understand that that is not only the announcement of the Senator from Iowa, but was the announcement of the last Republican convention.

Now, I want to ask the Senator from Iowa if there is any difference between that sort of a tariff and a prohibitive tariff?

Mr. CUMMINS. I think there is.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator will pardon me a moment, not for a question, but for an interruption—it seems to me there is none, and I will explain why, and I will not take long. In the old days—or not very old days, either, but in the former days—the Republican orators and writers announced that it wanted a tariff equal to the difference between *wages* abroad and *wages* in America, wages being but one factor in the cost of production, their claim being that protectionism was advocated and maintained "for the protection of American labor."

In that I did not see a tariff which was prohibitive. But if in fixing your tariff rates you are to include all the factors in the cost of production, then you arrive at this result: If you fix a rate so high that it meets the entire difference in the cost of production, no matter what makes the cost of production, difference of latitude, or training, or in fertility of land, or whatnot, then you fix a rate at which the cost of the article as manufactured in the United States is at least equal to, or a little bit above—because you would give yourself the margin of course in fixing it—what the article can be turned out for in the foreign field or factory, and then if the foreigner, in order to sell in the American market and make a profit in competition with the American who is producing the same goods, whether in farm or factory—if he is to sell in our market at all, he must sell without a profit at a price equal to what he can produce at plus the tariff and plus the transportation in competition with our producer who can sell at cost of production plus a profit and still sell cheaper.

If that sort of doctrine were applied between two people who were working in the same village it would not be prohibitive. It would put them upon an equality. But if you make a difference in rate equal to the entire difference in the cost of production, then you leave the foreigner handicapped by the ocean freight and whatsoever else may constitute the cost of transportation; so that it is impossible for the foreign producer to sell in the American market at all, and thus you have created for him a prohibitive tariff. There is but one thing I can see which recommends it. If the American behind the tariff wall attempt to effect a combination or a trust and make a very unreasonable rate, away and above the cost of production plus the tariff, plus the cost of transportation, and plus a reasonable profit, then the foreigner could come in at a slight profit above the cost of production plus the cost of transportation, plus the tariff. Even then the trust might reduce for the time being, until it had discouraged him and other men like him, and then go on with the game which it is now playing under the aegis of legislation at the cost of the American consumer.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, to one holding the view that I do of the doctrine of protection, and to one interpreting our platform as I interpret it, the question or statement of the Senator from Mississippi is easy of answer. If the cost of production is to be considered at the point of production, the consequence suggested by him would follow. I do not so understand the doctrine of protection, and I have never attempted to so apply it. To paraphrase it a trifle, I understand the doctrine of protection to be that measure of duties—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

Mr. CUMMINS. Just a moment, now. I understand the doctrine of protection to be that measure of duties that will enable the home producer to enter the markets of his own country and sell his products there at a fair profit in competition with his foreign rival. I do not believe that the doctrine can be measured by estimating the cost of production at the point of production. What is our purpose? Our purpose is to enable the producers of this country to get into their own markets and to occupy them at a fair profit, and if they increase their prices above a fair profit then to admit at once the foreign competitor. That is the purpose of the protective doctrine, and that is the meaning, as I understand it, of the phrase "cost of production."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield further to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. CUMMINS. Yes, sir.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the meaning of the Republican platform were as explained by the Senator from Iowa, then the man who worded it used very awkward English, because the wording is "the cost of production," not "the cost of marketing." If the platform had meant that the rates were to equalize the difference between the cost of production in America and the cost of production plus transportation abroad, then a man ordinarily cunning in the use of English would have said "the cost of marketing the foreign product in America." But that was not said.

One more thing and then I shall not interrupt the continuity of the remarks of the Senator from Iowa any further.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am very glad to have the Senator from Mississippi interrupt me, because I am not delivering a prepared speech.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I forgot something when I asked the Senator the question. Not only does the Republican platform say that the rate must be high enough to be equal to "the difference between" the foreign "cost of production" and the home cost of production, but it says the home "cost of production plus a reasonable profit," which makes it somewhat more prohibitive still, if you can say that a thing which is already prohibitive could be more prohibitive.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, of course the Senator from Mississippi knows that there have been at times some differences of opinion between the speaker and certain interpreters of the Republican doctrine of protection. I do not want to bind them, I do not attempt to bind them, but I know what binds me. In every case what I want to do in attaching duties to the products of American enterprise is to put such duties upon them as will enable the American people to raise them, produce them, take them to the market, and sell them to the American people at a fair profit. My purpose is always to accomplish that end.

Any duty that rises higher than is necessary to protect the American producer is one which I condemn as utterly and as wholly as the Senator from Mississippi. Any duty which does less than that, assuming now that the enterprise is one which is entitled to any protection at all, is utterly inefficient and could not be in compliance with or fulfillment of any doctrine of that character.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will ask the Senator from Iowa one more question. I am afraid I am doing like a great many people who say "in conclusion" seven or eight times before they conclude.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Mississippi can not have too many appearances.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the Senator from Iowa think that if over 100 per cent were necessary as a rate of duty in order to equalize the cost of foreign and of domestic production that that duty ought to be levied?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I answer that from two points of view. I can conceive of an article that could not be produced in this country in competition with some other country without a duty of 100 per cent, but if I found an article that required a duty of 100 per cent in order to perpetuate its production in this country, it would be conclusive evidence to me that we ought to abandon the production of that article.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield further to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If I had answered my own question, I could not have answered it more to my own satisfaction.

Mr. CUMMINS. "Praise from Sir Hubert is praise indeed."

Mr. WILLIAMS. On the woolen manufactures of this country the duties are over 100 per cent in very many cases—

Mr. CUMMINS. It is my opinion—

Mr. WILLIAMS. And on various other articles. For six years at every Congress, at the other end of this Capitol, the floor leader of the minority there introduced a bill to reduce all duties over 100 per cent down to 100 per cent except where there were countervailing internal-revenue duties, when, of course, the import duty must be equal to the internal-revenue duty, and he could never get consideration of it in a Republican Committee on Ways and Means and could never get a corporal's guard of Republicans in this entire country to express themselves as willing to see such a law passed.

Mr. CUMMINS. If the Senator from Mississippi would join with me—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree absolutely with the Senator from Iowa in the answer that he made.

Mr. CUMMINS. Does the Senator from Mississippi agree with me also that we ought to put upon all articles the measure of protection to which I have referred, and will he join with me in an effort to so adjust the tariff duties of the United States that they shall measure that difference in cost as I have interpreted it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, while the gentlemen of the school of thinking to which the Senator from Mississippi belongs are out of power, we would gladly, or he at any rate would gladly, vote for any bill which would put a reasonable tariff rate upon articles rather than the present extortionate rate; for almost any revision downward. But if the school of economical thought to which the Senator from Mississippi belongs ever gets in power, the Senator from Mississippi will try, to the best of his ability, to regulate taxation in accordance with the needs of the Government and not in accordance with the needs of private enterprise, and he will try his best to divorce big business from government and government from it. He will try his best to have the Government of the United States walk in a pathway which will convince the world that it is a government and not a silent partner in a firm of hothousers of private business. He will try to have taxation so levied that the Government may have abundant revenue to do everything which it ought to do constitutionally and yet at the same time not to prostitute the taxing power for the purpose of putting dollars by legislation into the pocket of any man, no matter how great and no matter how humble, whether he be a farmer or a manufacturer or a miner.

Mr. SMOOT rose.

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. I wanted to ask the Senator from Iowa whether I understood him correctly as saying that if there is any business in the United States which requires a protective duty of more than 100 per cent he would be in favor of abolishing that business?

Mr. CUMMINS. I can not conceive, Mr. President, of any business in the United States that will honestly require a duty of more than 100 per cent. It is beyond the power of my imagination.

Mr. SMOOT. I could state a number of articles made in the United States where I think the Senator himself would concede that it would be impossible to manufacture them in this country at that rate. Let me take the lithographic view cards, the making of which has become a great business in this country; 100 per cent will not make the difference between cost of production in this country and Germany; 200 per cent will not make the difference; 300 per cent will not make the difference.

Mr. CUMMINS. Then I think we had better take them from abroad.

Mr. SMOOT. I am just asking the Senator the question as I should like to know the Senator's position in a case of this kind. It was proven before the Finance Committee not once but many times, by invoices, by the cost of production abroad, and by every means that it was in the power of the committee to obtain. I believe when the rate was increased two or three hundred per cent in the last tariff bill Senators did not object to it after it had been explained to them. It was a business proposition. I wanted to know whether the Senator really felt that a business of this kind ought to be abolished in this country and the articles purchased from abroad.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have no hesitation whatever in saying that I am as insistent in giving to the real industries of the United States the full measure of protection, which I have attempted to describe, as any man in this Chamber, but when it is proposed to take a business that requires 300 per cent duty, and, therefore, which will advance the price 300 per cent or more, and stimulate it either into existence or into growth through the medium of a tariff duty, I rebel.

Mr. SMOOT and Mr. WILLIAMS addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield, and to whom?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to ask—

The VICE PRESIDENT. To whom does the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa this question: If the theory of the Senator from Utah were followed out to its logical conclusion, would it not lead us necessarily to a duty, say, of 1,000 per cent in order that the United States might produce their own bananas—under glass, probably—but they could be produced. Like Tom Carlyle, "I thank God that mankind are not logical," and I hope I can thank

God that the Senator from Utah is not logical. If, however, his theory were carried out to its logical result, would it not lead to an absurdity just like that?

Mr. CUMMINS. It is impossible to tell to what length that theory might lead us. I do not believe the Senator from Utah, who is a staunch protectionist, wants to subject the doctrine of protection, which is a wise policy for our country, to any such criticism as his instance or his example certainly will create.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly not, Mr. President. I called attention to this one particular case to find out the position of the Senator from Iowa; but the comparison of the Senator from Mississippi between the growing of bananas and the manufacture of lithographic view cards in this country is so absurd that it is not worthy of consideration.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the Senator mean to say that the manufacturing of postal cards is so superior in its nature, is a pursuit so much better for mankind that this little manufacturing process of making picture cards is so much worthier of consideration than the agricultural industry of raising bananas that to compare one with the other as an extension of the logic involved is absurd?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. WILLIAMS. If we are to pay 300 per cent in order that somebody may not have to go out of the business of manufacturing postal view cards, in the name of God why logically should we not pay a thousand per cent in order that children may eat "American bananas," patriotically waving the flag of the United States while they consume them, at a dollar apiece?

Mr. SMOOT and Mr. GALLINGER addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield, and to whom?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield first to the Senator from Utah and then to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. SMOOT. The difference between the item mentioned by the Senator from Mississippi and the item mentioned by me is that in the case of the duty upon postal cards the retail purchasers here pay no more for them, but the Senator is speaking of the consumer paying a dollar apiece for bananas, which is an entirely different proposition and there can be no comparison.

I agree with the Senator from Iowa as to the beneficial results of protection, but I believe also that if the actual cost of producing goods in this country and the actual cost of producing goods in a foreign country was the duty levied upon them and no more, our markets would be taken away from the American manufacturer by foreign manufacturers. There is no bigger curse to our protective system than undervaluation of goods entering the ports of this country. We base our duty upon the foreign valuation of producing goods and they are admitted into this country sometimes at less than half the value, which cuts the duty in two.

Again, Mr. President, there are countries that have anti-dumping laws. Canada, for instance, has one. An American manufacturer, overloaded with goods, rather than stop his mill may look for a foreign country to sell them in, sometimes at cost. If he desires to sell in Canada, he is met with an anti-dumping law. No goods can be sent into Canada and sold cheaper than they are sold in the country where they are manufactured. I have seen in this country, time and again, business concerns absolutely ruined by the great Chemical Trust of Germany shipping goods into this country below cost, until the manufacturing concerns of this country were closed up. Then the prices were immediately advanced and the American people were made to pay for all that the great trust in Germany had lost in reduced prices sold at in order to close up the American institutions. If the difference was only measured between the actual cost of production in this country and a foreign land, I say that that same thing would happen to a great many industries of this country.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I rose to call the attention of the Senator from Iowa to a statement he made which I think he had not fully considered. I am interested in the Senator's discussion, and I have tried to follow him as closely as possible when I could be in the Senate Chamber.

A moment ago the Senator from Iowa said that an article manufactured in this country which required 200 or 300 per cent protection was indefensible, and that he never would consent to a duty of that kind, which would raise the price of the article 200 or 300 per cent to the American consumer.

The Senator doubtless has given some attention to the fact that as long as Germany had a monopoly of the post card busi-

ness Germany could charge the United States just what she pleased, and she did that very thing, while since the duty was put on post cards at a point where the American manufacturer could compete the post cards are being made in this country and are selling, I understand, at just about the price the American purchaser paid before that duty was placed upon that particular manufacture.

It is the old story, that if you give an individual a monopoly, he can charge what he pleases. If you give a nation a monopoly, that nation can charge just what it pleases. We come back to the oft-repeated and very wholesome illustration furnished by the fact that at one time we paid Great Britain \$170 a ton for steel rails when we were not making any in this country.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I have heard the illustration with respect to steel rails many times before, but it never impressed me, because I am aware, and I know the Senator from New Hampshire is aware, that it has not been the duties levied by the United States upon steel rails that have reduced the price of steel rails from \$170 a ton to \$28 a ton. There have been so many other factors in the development of the business and the resulting decrease in the price of this commodity that, in my opinion, the duties levied by this country are negligible causes in that reduction.

Mr. GALLINGER. And yet, if the Senator will permit me, Mr. President, he must admit, because it is an historical fact, that as soon as we did impose a rate of duty which we thought was adequate and which proved to be adequate upon foreign steel rails, immediately the price in this country did decrease, and very largely decreased. Will not the Senator admit that if England to-day had a monopoly of the manufacture of steel rails, as Germany practically had of the post view cards, England would charge us a higher rate for steel rails than we are paying now, manufacturing them in our own country, or importing them, if you please, from foreign countries?

Mr. CUMMINS. I am perfectly willing to agree that any monopoly will charge all that the traffic will bear in this country or any other, and that is the reason why I have been so insistent against a rate of duty that will lead or could lead to a profitable monopoly.

I did not intend, Mr. President, to drift myself or allow this discussion to be drifted into the merits or demerits of the tariff generally. I bring it back again to the point from which I started. Entirely aside from the merits of protection, you are about to put the farmer of this country into free competition with his only competitor, with his only rival, and you at the same time refuse to give him a freer market with respect to the things that he must buy. I say, and it is a reiteration, that that is an offense against justice and against morals that the American people will neither forgive nor condone.

I have no doubt that there will be much discontent. I have no doubt there will be great injury wrought to the farmers of this country with respect to many of their products by the removal of these duties. Every man must know that, no matter what was true 10 years ago, it is true now that the American farmer is receiving some benefit, direct benefit, from his tariff duties, and if you take that benefit away from him he will recognize and resent the injustice. It is not the money that he loses or will lose that will be the chief cause of his resentment. Carlyle said years and years ago that it was not what a man had that makes the happiness or the misery of him; it is not the privations that he must endure, not the hardships that he must suffer, not the poverty through which he must pass; it is injustice that constitutes the insupportable burden, and against which free men always have fought and always will fight.

When this bill passes in its present form the loudest cry will not be because the farmers of North Dakota are unable to sell their wheat at as high a price as they might have otherwise sold it. It will not be because their fortunes may be impaired to some degree. It will be because the Government of their country solemnly, after long deliberation, determined that they were not entitled to the same consideration at its hands as are the manufacturers and other producers of the country. This will be the condemnation of this measure, against which no man can stand.

I wonder, as I have been wondering from the beginning, how it can be contemplated that this indignity shall be put upon the farmer when, at the same time, you add riches to the packer, riches to the miller, riches to the United States Steel Corporation, riches to every manufacturer of the products contained or mentioned in this arrangement.

There will come, Senators, a day of reckoning, not because you are merely despoiling the beneficiaries of the protective tariff—I mean the farmers now—of some of their advantages, but because you refuse to listen to their demand for justice.

Do not for a moment think that those who, no matter how high their motives may be, no matter how sincerely they may think this is a step in the right direction, do not for a moment think that the people will fail to fasten the responsibility upon the men who inflict the wrong. It is no light or trivial issue that you are presenting to the people of the Nation.

Ah! I heard it said here just the other day from a very distinguished and eloquent Senator that although the farmer was about to be deprived of the direct benefit or advantage which he might in future years enjoy from the protective tariff, yet he would still be surrounded by the incidental advantages of the protective tariff given to manufacturers.

Do not be deceived by that illusion. When you put the farmer of this country into free competition with his rival in Canada it will make no difference to him whether this country or Canada grows in manufactures. The farmer of North Dakota will care little about the development of Minneapolis, because it will be just as beneficial to him if a bushel of Canadian wheat is consumed in Canada as it will if it were consumed in the United States. This measure means that we have undertaken to care for and dispose of the entire agricultural products of both Nations. It will matter little to the farmer of this country whether a new enterprise shall arise within our borders or whether it shall arise in Canada. We shall be just as much interested in having Canada grow so that it will consume its surplus of agricultural products as we shall be in having our own enterprises so grow that we will consume our surplus. Our problem will be to consume somehow or other the entire product of both the United States and Canada. When our Republican friends shall go in the future to the farmers of this country and say, to them, "Although we have taken away from you the direct advantages which you might have hoped that you would enjoy under the tariff, nevertheless you are interested in the development of our industries, in enlarging our markets, in the growth of our cities, in the addition of new enterprises," the farmer will say, "I would just as soon have an additional enterprise in Canada that will help to consume the surplus there, which otherwise we must take, and therefore there is no compensation to me in the incidental growth or development of our own country."

From every point of view the measure proposed is repugnant to one's sense of right. I have yet to hear a single reply to that statement, save that it is a step in the right direction. I said yesterday, and I now repeat, it is a step in the wrong direction, because it will not accomplish, either from the standpoint of the Senators upon the other side of this Chamber or from the standpoint of Senators upon this side of the Chamber, the objects which they seek to accomplish.

Mr. President, I now intend to take up for a few moments some features of this bill which have not yet been the subject of discussion. I want your attention; and if I can not show you that it is immature and imperfect, even if you are looking at it in the hope of accomplishing that which the executive department or the State Department wants to accomplish, then I despair of the force of reason.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, before the Senator from Iowa proceeds with the discussion of the other branch of the subject I should like to have his opinion expressed to the Senate upon another feature of what he has been discussing. If I understand the attitude of the Senator correctly, it is that there is nothing in the nature of true reciprocity in this bill; that there is no opportunity for us to expand our agricultural exportations into Canada; and, therefore, the only thing which is reciprocal or attempted to be reciprocal is an exchange of agricultural products for agricultural products, where, in fact, the exchange is all on one side—coming from Canada into the United States. If I understand the Senator correctly, his idea is that the bill ought to be so framed that we can at least receive in return for the agricultural importations some manufactured exportations into Canada, so as to make it reciprocal in noncompetitive articles. It is right at this point that I want the attention of the Senator.

Even with the tariff wall between the United States and Canada our manufacturers have been able to leap over that wall with their products, and out of \$376,000,000 importations we have been able to send them \$223,000,000. Reducing that to percentages, it is about 61 per cent of all of Canada's imports. Canada must continue to import a great quantity of articles which we do not and can not produce. That would probably make up 30 per cent of her imports. Therefore we could not hope to secure more, with the increase of her population and

the natural increase of our exportations, than about 70 per cent, if we secured all of the exportations into that country to which we would be entitled.

Mr. CUMMINS. Certainly.

Mr. McCUMBER. If that is the case, if we are, without the reduction of a cent of the import duties of Canada, able to import nearly all of the manufactured articles which Canada produces, then, if you will lower the duties, who is to get the benefit other than the difference that will be pocketed by the manufacturers themselves in the reduction of the duties that they have got to pay? In other words, their business will be made more profitable to the extent of the duty that will be remitted to them; and at the same time there is nothing in this bill, if I understand it rightly, that will reduce the price of their products to the American consumer as a compensation to the farmer who is to suffer.

The particular point that I wanted the Senator's always lucid explanation of is as to how we are to be benefited, how even the manufacturers are to be benefited, by an increase in their exportations by the little lowering of duty that is allowed in the Canadian tariff?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I had it in mind to deal more fully with the phase of the subject just suggested by the Senator from North Dakota when I came to analyze what this agreement really is. It has not been analyzed as yet, and we do not know the meagerness of the concessions granted by Canada to the United States. They have not even been stated so that we could comprehend how little we are to receive. But I have no hesitation in answering in a general way the inquiry of the Senator from North Dakota.

Years ago the advocates of reciprocity understood that if they were to give to Canada a better market, a fuller market, for her agricultural products, her natural products—for it was not in the old days confined to agricultural products, but it was extended to all of her so-called natural products—if we would give Canada an admission to our markets for the things that Canada wanted then, and has always wanted, and which is the only thing that Canada wants of the United States, for Canada cares nothing about the slight reduction of our duties upon manufactured products, because she can not compete in our own country with our manufacturers. All that she cares for is the admission of her agricultural products, and in a day in which our surplus was large and in which with respect to the great staples of wheat, of oats, of barley, and the like, our prices were the export prices, because we had so large a surplus, I for one was willing to give Canada admission to our markets with her agricultural products if she would give us such admission to her markets for our manufactured products as would enable us to take possession of those markets and very greatly extend or widen our opportunities. But now we have gone on through these years gradually nearing the point where consumption and production of agricultural products in our country was to meet, and in the meantime, notwithstanding the discriminating duties of Canada against our manufactured products, we have taken practically all the markets that can possibly be yielded to us.

The reductions which, as I shall show later on, are given us in the reciprocal dutiable list as to manufactured products will not, so far as we can estimate, increase by a farthing our exports into Canada of those products. As the Senator from North Dakota suggests, the only result will be, if that result shall follow, to slightly reduce the prices at which the Canadian consumer can take those products from our producers. There is no reciprocity in this measure—none whatsoever—and the sooner we strip it of its mask the better it will be for us and for the people of the United States. It is a proposition for the reduction of duties; that is all. It is a proposal for the removal of duties; that is all; and, to a degree, I am in sympathy with that proposition. I would like to take the tariff and revise it, according to the Republican doctrine, from the beginning to the end; but if we can not do that, and we must remove our agricultural duties under the combination that seems to have been formed here to that end, then I insist that other duties shall be removed at the same time and in the same instrument.

But now I come back again to the statement I made a few moments ago, that I propose to show you that if you have any regard for the dignity of our country and the welfare of our people, if you have any respect for the American Nation in its dealings with foreign countries, you can not accept this arrangement in the form in which it was sent to Congress and in the form in which it passed the House of Representatives. I shall state the question as clearly and as concisely as possible, and I have committed this statement to writing so that there can be no misunderstanding of my meaning.

If the bill were to pass in its present form and if thereafter Canada should establish duties in exact conformity to the provisions beginning, respectively, on pages 8 and 19, and the President should make the proclamation that would put the prescribed duties and the free list in operation, and if then the next day, month, or year Canada should change her duties, as she would have a perfect right to do, the duties and the free list we have established for ourselves would continue in operation indefinitely—that is to say, until Congress, always slow and sometimes uncertain, should take up the matter and make such changes as might be thought wise.

What do Senators think of such a situation, and is there a Senator here who denies that construction of the bill before us? If this bill is passed and Canada passes her bill, and Canada the next day shall change her duties, no matter how, our law continues as it was and as it is proposed to be written until somehow, sometime, Congress shall change or amend that law.

If we are to accept the basis which is proposed to us by the executive department, if we are to assume that the concessions which we grant to Canada are the consideration for the concessions which Canada grants to us, if Canada withdraws those concessions ought not ours to cease, not by the slow and uncertain process of legislative enactment, but, ipso facto, because the consideration upon which it is based has been withdrawn? Is there a Senator here who is willing to become responsible for an enactment which, if it be not of the sort which I have described, is a mere pretense? If we intend to reduce the duties as to Canada, let us do it boldly and openly and fairly. I will join in the effort; but if we are trading with Canada, if we are giving her certain free admissions, and if we are reducing certain duties in consideration, and only because Canada is giving us certain free admissions and certain reductions in her duties, when Canada destroys the consideration, ought not our duties to resume their place in the general tariff law?

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. CUMMINS. Yes; I do.

Mr. OVERMAN. Suppose Canada should do as the Senator has indicated, would we not then have free wood pulp, free print paper, and free lumber?

Mr. CUMMINS. No, sir; we would not. That is one of the objections I have to this bill. Under it we will not have free lumber or anything like free lumber; we will not have free wood pulp and free print paper, or anything like free wood pulp and free print paper.

Mr. OVERMAN. Would we not have lower duties than we have now?

Mr. CUMMINS. We would have slightly lower duties upon lumber and we would have a limited territory from which to get free wood pulp and free print paper; that is all. But I am now putting it upon another basis. The Senator from North Carolina is a man of great influence in his own party councils. Why does he not press, in connection with this, some proposition, a bill or an amendment, which will give us free lumber and will give us free paper and free pulp, no matter what conditions may be attached in Canada? I am simply trying to expose the dangers of the measure pressed upon us. We are asked to make a bargain, and yet we have not taken the common, ordinary precaution in the bill to say that if the other side takes away the consideration that our concessions shall also fail. Does not the Senator from North Carolina believe that that ought to be a part of the bill?

Mr. OVERMAN. If Canada refuses to carry out her compact I think we could repeal it, but I think Canada will carry out her part.

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not want to be understood as impeaching in any way the motive or even suggesting bad faith on the part of Canada. Nothing has occurred that leads me to suspect that she will not act in good faith, but, as reasonable and self-respecting persons, when we are making a contract, as this is apparently, ought we not to insert those provisions that are common in contracts? We are making, practically speaking, a legislative treaty; we are giving something to Canada in consideration of things that Canada gives to us; and yet we sit here apparently willing to leave to the uncertain future the consequences which will follow if Canada desires to withdraw; and Canada has expressly said, and our country has expressly said, that either is at perfect liberty to withdraw whenever it pleases. No notice is required; no preliminary negotiations are necessary.

I do not intend to pursue this suggestion longer. I have felt that when once it was fairly impressed upon the Senate there must be a disposition to correct it in that respect; and one of

my amendments is for the purpose of correcting it in that respect, and making it take not only the form but the substance of a bargain.

I desire to suggest another peculiarity of this arrangement—

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. BRISTOW. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bacon	Cullom	McCumber	Smith, Md.
Bailey	Cummins	McLean	Smoot
Bourne	Curtis	Martin, Va.	Stone
Brandegee	Dixon	Martine, N. J.	Sutherland
Briggs	du Pont	Nelson	Swanson
Eristow	Foster	Overman	Thornton
Brown	Gallinger	Page	Townsend
Bryan	Gore	Penrose	Watson
Burnham	Gronna	Perkins	Williams
Burton	Guggenheim	Poinexter	Works
Clark, Wyo.	Heyburn	Pomerene	
Crane	Johnson, Me.	Rayner	
Culberson	Lippitt	Shively	

Mr. BRYAN. My colleague [Mr. FLETCHER] is detained by his duties in connection with the Lorimer investigation, and is therefore unavoidably absent from the Senate on this occasion.

Mr. THORNTON. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. JOHNSTON] is a member of the Committee on Privileges and Elections and is engaged in the hearing of the Lorimer case. He is therefore detained from the Senate at this time. I ask that this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] was called from the city last evening, but he is paired with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], who is also out of the city.

Mr. POINDEXTER. My colleague [Mr. JONES] is engaged in the Lorimer investigation, and is therefore unavoidably absent from the Senate.

Mr. PAGE. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. DILLINGHAM] is unavoidably detained because of his connection with the Lorimer investigating committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-nine Senators have answered to the roll call. A quorum of the Senate is present.

Mr. CUMMINS. A further extraordinary defect in the bill—and now I ask the attention of lawyers especially—is that the dutiable list and the free list are so completely separated by the language used that Canada is given the option to accept the one and reject the other. I have already referred to the proviso in connection with the dutiable list, and beg the Senate to notice that if we were to pass the bill, that then Canada could change her duties so as to conform to the duties mentioned on pages 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15 without taking any action whatever with respect to the free list found on pages 16 to 23, inclusive, and nevertheless it would become the duty of the President to issue his proclamation upon the dutiable list, and thereafter our duties would be as the bill prescribes, and the free list could thus be wholly abandoned.

Do Senators get the full import of the statement I have just made? Under this bill we are extending to Canada the option to take either one or the other of these lists, or both, as she may desire. She can accept our reciprocal dutiable list and we will be bound. She can accept our free list without the dutiable list and we will be bound. I have never dreamed that when this weakness or defect in the measure was pointed out it would find a defender. I, of course, do not know whether it was the intention of our State Department to give to Canada an option of this character, but whatever may be or have been the intention upon either side, the proposition is so shockingly unfair that I take it for granted the Senate will not concur in any such jug-handled procedure, and that, therefore, it will be found necessary to amend the bill in this respect.

As the Senator from North Dakota said a few moments ago, the real thing that Canada wants of the United States is the free admission of agricultural products. She cares nothing about the other. If we have any advantage in the trade, it is in the other—in the reciprocal dutiable list. Now, suppose that Canada were to enact into law her part of the free list and not her part of the dutiable list. Do Senators think that the arrangement ought to go into effect unless it is assumed that the reciprocity here is article by article; that we have sufficient compensation for admitting free wheat into the United States in the admission of free wheat into Canada? Our compensation lies largely in the expansion of our trade in Canada in manufactured products, although I think there will be severe disappointment in that respect.

But do you not agree—and I am asking now and looking at the Senator from Missouri, because I know he is sincerely for this arrangement—would he be willing that Canada shall pass a law accepting the free list and rejecting the reciprocal dutiable list? If he would not, and I do not believe there is a Senator here, whether for or against the measure, who believes that it would be fair or just or right or in harmony with the spirit which led to these negotiations and which finally consummated them in the arrangement before us, who believes that Canada ought to have the option to take what is advantageous for her and deprive us of everything that is advantageous for us. Of course, we could then repeal our law. But surely Senators are not willing to remit the United States to that inadequate remedy.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is merely for a question. The Senator's discussion of this phase of the bill is novel and rather startling to me. I will ask the Senator, and I presume the question is unnecessary after the exposition the Senator has made of it, whether it is his view that if we should to-morrow vote upon this bill and pass it as it came to us from the House of Representatives, and Canada should on the succeeding day vote in favor of either the reciprocal exchange so called of certain articles, leaving out the free list, or vote in favor of the free list leaving out the portion of the bill relating to the exchanges, the reduction of duties, it would then be a valid law, so far as we are concerned, and we would be bound by it?

Mr. CUMMINS. Unquestionably.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is a very important matter.

Mr. CUMMINS. Unquestionably. I do not believe there is a lawyer in the Senate who, after having examined the matter, will assert that the result which I have stated will not follow.

Mr. GALLINGER. Did I understand the Senator to say that he had an amendment pending that would cure that?

Mr. CUMMINS. I have. It is one of the amendments I have offered. Allow me to make it now perfectly clear, because in our hurried and busy life we do not always give our attention to every phase of a matter of this sort.

I take first the reciprocal dutiable list. It begins as follows:

That there shall be levied, collected, and paid upon the articles hereinafter enumerated, the growth, product, or manufacture of the Dominion of Canada, when imported therefrom into the United States or any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands and the islands of Guam and Tutuila), in lieu of the duties now levied, collected, and paid, the following duties, namely:

Now, if there was nothing more and we passed the law, these duties would at once become effective and no other duties could be levied at our customhouses. I turn, however, to the condition which limits the effect of the law:

Provided, That the duties above enumerated shall take effect whenever the President of the United States shall have satisfactory evidence and shall make proclamation that on the articles hereinafter enumerated, the growth, product, or manufacture of the United States, or any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands and the islands of Guam and Tutuila), when imported therefrom into the Dominion of Canada, duties not in excess of the following are imposed, namely—

There is no association between that and any other part of this bill, and therefore whenever Canada shall impose duties not in excess of those which are mentioned in our list upon this series of articles, which are the same except in a few instances as are in our own lists, then our duties go into effect, no matter what Canada may do with regard to any other part of this bill.

And I turn likewise to the free list. It begins:

That the articles mentioned in the following paragraphs, the growth, product, or manufacture of the Dominion of Canada, when imported therefrom into the United States or any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands and the islands of Guam and Tutuila), shall be exempt from duty, namely—

Likewise, the moment this law is passed this free list becomes effective were it not for what I am about to read, which is as follows. I now read from page 19:

Provided, That the articles above enumerated, the growth, product, or manufacture of the Dominion of Canada, shall be exempt from duty when the President of the United States shall have satisfactory evidence and shall make proclamation that the following articles, the growth, product, or manufacture of the United States or any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands and the islands of Guam and Tutuila), are admitted into the Dominion of Canada free of duty, namely—

And then follows the same free list.

Undoubtedly we are extending to Canada in this bill the option to take either the reciprocal dutiable list or the reciprocal free list. I repeat the assertion that no lawyer will be found here to differ with me in that construction.

Now, I do not know what the intention of our Secretary of State may have been. It may have been a mere inadvertence or it may have been purposely so arranged. But I ask the Senate whether it is willing to make a proposition of that sort to the Dominion of Canada in which Canada can, without the least breach of good faith, take that list which constitutes our concessions to her and reject that list which constitutes her concessions to us, if there are any concessions to us? I do not believe we can maintain this impervious attitude of refusal to amend this arrangement in any respect whatsoever. If we adhere to it we abdicate the highest duties which the laws of the United States impose upon American citizens.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. HEYBURN. The attention of the Senator has doubtless been directed to the different provisions in the Canadian bill. They group them there.

Mr. CUMMINS. I know they do.

Mr. HEYBURN. And put them all under one head.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Canadian bill does not give the United States any option whatsoever. We must take them all or none. I have a copy of it. I thank the Senator from Idaho for making the suggestion, because it emphasizes the point I am making and it emphasizes the consequences of this indifferent mood which prevails in the Congress respecting a matter of this sort. It emphasizes the danger of accepting whatsoever comes to us without any examination or inclination to amend it if it is seen to be defective or imperfect. I feel sure that Senators will not refuse to make the bill what it ought to be in the respects I have mentioned.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. CUMMINS. Yes.

Mr. NELSON. I will inquire of the Senator from Iowa if he feels that he will be able to conclude his speech to-day, or will he desire further time?

Mr. CUMMINS. The subject has grown upon me so while on my feet, and we have had so wide a discussion relating to matters that were not within my original view, but which have been brought forward, and very properly brought forward by interruptions, that I fear I can not finish to-day what I have to say.

Mr. GALLINGER. Is the Senator willing to yield now?

Mr. CUMMINS. I am glad to yield.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 13 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 3 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, June 30, 1911, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 29, 1911.

APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY.

MEDICAL CORPS.

First Lieut. Edgar D. Craft, Medical Reserve Corps, to be first Lieutenant in the Medical Corps, with rank from February 17, 1911, to fill an original vacancy.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Samuel B. Thomas to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 19th day of May, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Medical Insp. James C. Byrnes to be a medical director in the Navy from the 11th day of June, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Asst. Surg. Joseph A. Biello to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy from the 11th day of April, 1911, upon the completion of three years' service as an assistant surgeon.

Richard H. Laning, a citizen of Washington, to be an assistant surgeon in the Navy from the 21st day of June, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

The following-named ensigns to be assistant civil engineers in the Navy from the 24th day of June, 1911, to fill vacancies:

David G. Copeland and
Greer A. Duncan.

ENVOYS EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTERS Plenipotentiary.

Lewis Einstein, of New York, now secretary of the legation at Peking, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotenti-

ary of the United States of America to Costa Rica, vice William L. Merry, resigned.

William W. Russell, of the District of Columbia, now minister resident and consul general to the Dominican Republic, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Dominican Republic, to fill an original vacancy.

Evan E. Young, of South Dakota, now Chief of the Division of Near Eastern Affairs, Department of State, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ecuador, vice Williams C. Fox, resigned.

Charles Dunning White, of New Jersey, now secretary of the legation at Habana, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Honduras, vice Fenton R. McCreery, resigned.

H. Percival Dodge, of Massachusetts, now resident diplomatic officer, Department of State, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Panama, vice Thomas C. Dawson, appointed resident diplomatic officer, Department of State.

Nicolay A. Grevstad, of Illinois, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Paraguay and Uruguay, vice Edwin V. Morgan, appointed envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Portugal.

SECRETARIES OF LEGATION.

Norval Richardson, of Mississippi, now second secretary of the legation at Habana, to be secretary of the legation of the United States of America at Copenhagen, Denmark, vice William K. Wallace, nominated to be second secretary of the legation at Habana.

Jordan Herbert Stabler, of Maryland, now second secretary of the embassy at Berlin, to be secretary of the legation of the United States of America at Guatemala, Guatemala, vice Charles Campbell, jr., nominated to be second secretary of the embassy at Tokyo.

Hugh S. Gibson, of California, now private secretary to the Assistant Secretary of State, to be secretary of the legation of the United States of America at Habana, Cuba, vice Charles Dunning White, nominated to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Honduras.

Edward T. Williams, of Ohio, now assistant chief of the Division of Far Eastern Affairs, Department of State, to be secretary of the legation of the United States of America at Peking, China, vice Lewis Einstein, nominated to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Costa Rica.

SECOND SECRETARIES OF LEGATION.

Charles Campbell, jr., of Virginia, now secretary of the legation at Guatemala, to be second secretary of the embassy of the United States of America at Tokyo, Japan, vice George T. Summerlin, nominated to be second secretary of the legation at Peking.

George T. Summerlin, of Louisiana, now second secretary of the embassy at Tokyo, to be second secretary of the legation of the United States of America at Peking, China, vice Percival Heintzleman, appointed assistant chief of the Division of Far Eastern Affairs, Department of State.

William K. Wallace, of Colorado, now secretary of the legation at Copenhagen, to be second secretary of the legation of the United States of America at Habana, Cuba, vice Norval Richardson, nominated to be secretary of the legation at Copenhagen.

COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION.

Philander P. Claxton, of Tennessee, to be Commissioner of Education, vice Elmer E. Brown, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 29, 1911.

SECRETARY OF LEGATION.

Norval Richardson to be secretary of the legation at Copenhagen, Denmark.

PROMOTION IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

First Lieut. John Givven Berry to be a captain.

BOARD OF CHARITIES OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

George E. Hamilton to be a member of the Board of Charities. Myer Cohen to be a member of the Board of Charities.

POSTMASTER.

OREGON.

Jay P. Lucas, Hood River.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, June 29, 1911.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, ever ready to uphold, sustain, and guide those who seek to know and do Thy will, we wait upon Thee for light to guide, strength to sustain us, in every legitimate effort to right existing wrongs, remove unjust conditions, lift up the fallen, that we may fulfill the law of Christ, "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." For thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, June 26, 1911, was read and approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence for two weeks on account of important business.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Lillian J. Hartley, no adverse report having been made thereon.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. CRAVENS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bill:

H. R. 8049. An act to authorize the extension and widening of Colorado Avenue NW. from Longfellow Street to Sixteenth Street, and of Kennedy Street NW. through lot No. 800, square No. 2718.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 1) to correct errors in the enrollment of certain appropriation acts approved March 4, 1911, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. WARREN, Mr. PERKINS, and Mr. FOSTER as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendment to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 39) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that Senators shall be elected by the people of the several States, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, asked a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. CLARK of Wyoming, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. BACON as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ELECTION OF SENATORS.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in view of the agreement which I note in the Record was made here a few days ago, I suppose nothing can be done, and therefore would ask that House joint resolution 39 with a Senate amendment lie upon the table temporarily.

INFORMATION FROM SECRETARY OF STATE CONCERNING CERTAIN STATEMENTS BY JOHN L. GRIFFITHS, CONSUL GENERAL, LONDON.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Foreign Affairs to report the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 188, H. Rept. 58), introduced by Mr. HAMILL, of New Jersey, requesting the Secretary of State to furnish the House of Representatives with information concerning certain statements made by John L. Griffiths, consul general at London, with amendments, and I ask that the resolution as amended do now pass.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York sends to the Clerk's desk a privileged resolution and a report thereon, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, as I understand from reading the Record, there was a very clear agreement at the last meeting of the House that nothing was to be done to-day, and I suggest that the gentleman withhold the report until we have a House here that can consider it.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I think when the gentleman from Pennsylvania hears the resolution as amended read he

will not object to it. It is a privileged resolution of inquiry calling on the Secretary of State for information, and there is no objection to it as amended.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from New York that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], I understand, is absent under the belief, and properly under the belief, that no business would be transacted to-day except to meet and adjourn, and then to meet again and adjourn over the 4th of July.

Mr. DALZELL. That is my understanding, and I shall object to any business being transacted.

Mr. BARTLETT. And, so far as I am concerned, I believe the agreement ought to be religiously kept.

Mr. SULZER. Under the circumstances, then, Mr. Speaker, I will report the resolution with amendments favorably, and it can be called up at some future time.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL SATURDAY.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Saturday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet on Saturday, July 1, 1911, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers systems, Cal. (H. Doc. No. 81); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with accompanying illustrations.

2. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Salem and Beverly outer harbors, Mass. (H. Doc. No. 79); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Sandusky Harbor, Ohio (H. Doc. No. 78); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Malden River, Mass. (H. Doc. No. 77); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with accompanying illustrations.

5. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of C. R. McClarin, administrator of estate of John McClarin, deceased (H. Doc. No. 80); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

The bill (H. R. 12028) granting a pension to Herman J. Wacker; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 12029) granting a pension to Mary Julka; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 8397) granting a pension to Charles Kline; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 12027) granting a pension to Paul Heineman; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 4586) granting a pension to Marie O. Burnett; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 8503) granting a pension to Catherine E. Jacobs; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 12116) granting a pension to J. K. Rainey; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 12154) for the improvement of Platt National Park, of Sulphur, Murray County, Okla.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 12155) to establish the legislative reference bureau of the Library of Congress and the congressional corps of legislative investigators, and to maintain them until July 1, 1912; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12156) to cooperate with the States in encouraging instruction in agriculture, the trades and industries, and home economics in secondary schools; in maintaining instruction in these vocational subjects in State normal schools; in maintaining extension departments in State colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts; and to appropriate money and regulate its expenditure; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CALDER: A bill (H. R. 12157) to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the grades of commissioned chiefs and warrant officers of the Navy of the United States; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 12158) to promote the American merchant marine in foreign trade and the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MARTIN of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 12159) providing for the discontinuance of the grade of post noncommissioned staff officer and creating the grade of warrant officer in lieu thereof; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia): A bill (H. R. 12160) to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the widening and extension of Minnesota Avenue SE. from its present terminus near Pennsylvania Avenue SE. to the Sheriff Road," approved February 26, 1909; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 12161) providing for the discontinuance of the grade of post noncommissioned staff officer and creating the grade of warrant officer in lieu thereof; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Resolution (H. Res. 225) authorizing the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department to employ clerical and other assistance; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. LOBECK: Resolution (H. Res. 226) to investigate violations of the antitrust act of 1890 and other acts; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Resolution (H. Res. 227) seeking information from the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 127) relating to printing speeches in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 11) requesting the President of the United States to invite foreign nations to participate in the celebration of the completion of the Oversea Railroad connecting the mainland of Florida with Key West; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri (by request): Memorial from the Legislature of Wisconsin memorializing Congress in enacting cold-storage legislation, not to limit the time during which dairy products may be kept in cold storage to less than one year; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 12162) granting an increase of pension to Rufus Conger; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12163) granting an increase of pension to Jesse B. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12164) granting an increase of pension to William B. Seaton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12165) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Henry Gregg; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 12166) granting a pension to Mary E. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12167) granting a pension to James N. Snodgrass; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12168) granting an increase of pension to James G. Haner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12169) granting an increase of pension to John Murphy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12170) granting an increase of pension to William R. Hardy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANDLER: A bill (H. R. 12171) for the relief of the heirs of John B. Jones, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 12172) granting an increase of pension to Columbus Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12173) to donate to the city of St. Augustine, Fla., for park purposes, the tract of land known as the "Powder House Lot"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CONNELL: A bill (H. R. 12174) granting an increase of pension to Robert R. Butts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 12175) granting an increase of pension to Isaac H. Orndorff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DWIGHT: A bill (H. R. 12176) granting an increase of pension to Anne Gertrude Robinson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 12177) granting an increase of pension to George R. McCelplin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 12178) granting an increase of pension to Robert H. Bellfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12179) granting an increase of pension to John R. Watt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HANNA: A bill (H. R. 12180) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. A. Mergel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 12181) for the relief of Aaron L. Abbey; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky (by request): A bill (H. R. 12182) for the relief of Sarah P. Jenkins; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LINDSAY: A bill (H. R. 12183) granting an increase of pension to Edward Bloom; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 12184) granting a pension to Fred McCloud; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 12185) for the relief of Joseph Clucas; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MURDOCK: A bill (H. R. 12186) granting an increase of pension to James Dodwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 12187) granting an increase of pension to Mary Byron; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12188) granting a pension to Jennie L. Tate; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 12189) granting a pension to Benjamin F. Tye; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12190) granting an increase of pension to John Smallwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12191) granting an increase of pension to Felix T. Begley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12192) granting an increase of pension to Jefferson Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12193) granting an increase of pension to Joseph S. Prones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12194) to grant a muster to Jesse Mattingly; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12195) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Peter Wilson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12196) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Jeremiah Cracroft; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 12197) granting a pension to Joseph Kuebbeler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12198) granting an increase of pension to Frederick W. Duden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12199) granting a pension to Ruel Sherman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12200) granting an increase of pension to George A. Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12201) granting an increase of pension to Charles M. Siglar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12202) granting an increase of pension to Michael Holland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12203) granting an increase of pension to Edward Blanchard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12204) granting an increase of pension to George W. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12205) granting a pension to Hattie C. Mills; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12206) granting an increase of pension to James M. Matthews; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12207) granting an increase of pension to Levi Berst; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12208) granting an increase of pension to Noyes S. Lee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12209) granting an increase of pension to Emma A. Crowell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIS: A bill (H. R. 12210) granting an increase of pension to William H. Kellison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of Harry O. Gorm, Omar Layton, and William McKinley, all of Coshocton, Ohio, asking for the passage of the Berger resolution for an investigation of the kidnaping of the McNamara brothers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AYRES: Petition of citizens of the Bronx, in favor of parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas: Papers to accompany bill (H. R. 9589) for the relief of John B. Hefley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany bill (H. R. 11249) for the relief of Isaac R. Fain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HANNA: Petition of Mrs. Viola Fouts and others, of Towner, N. Dak., urging support of the bill introduced by Mr. WEBB for the purpose of checking the shipment of liquor into prohibition States; to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of numerous farmers and laborers of Ray, N. Dak., in reference to the kidnaping of the McNamara brothers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Oscar Samby, of Bugan, N. Dak., asking that the duty on raw and refined sugars be reduced; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAUGEN: Petition of citizens of Little Cedar, Mitchell County, Iowa, protesting against parcels-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. JAMES: Petitions of various citizens of Paducah, Ky., asking for a reduction of the duty on raw sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KINDRED: Petitions of numerous citizens of New York, urging the adoption of House resolution 166; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of National Paper Trade Association of the United States, protesting against certain reductions contained in the reciprocity agreement with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Grain Dealers' Association of Illinois, protesting against delay in forwarding trade journals, etc., by the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Resolution by the Providence Real Estate Exchange, urging upon Congress the necessity of a 30-foot channel in the Providence River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Mrs. Margarete Oesterlein, of Newport, R. I., in support of House resolution 166; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. REILLY: Petition of German-American Alliance of Meriden, Conn., urging the adoption of House resolution 166, introduced by Mr. SULZER; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. REYBURN: Petition of the Philadelphia Association of Retail Druggists, protesting against the enactment of House bill 8887; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of Hardware Merchants & Manufacturers' Association and others, of Philadelphia, protesting against the abandonment of the Philadelphia Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: Petition of La Verne Fonda, of Marshall, Mich., in favor of parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Charles W. Ryan and 13 others, of Battle Creek, Mich., favoring a parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of C. E. Wise and 20 others, of Quincy, Mich.; F. L. Farnsworth and Henry Katzemeyer, of Hillsdale, Mich.; J. C. Walsh & Son and 19 others, of Grand Ledge, Mich.; L. E. Quincy, of Fulton, Mich.; Blakely & Son and 6 others, of Cambria, Mich.; B. T. Woodbury & Co. and 19 others, of Homer, Mich.; Vicksburg Lumber Co. and 7 others, of Vicksburg, Mich.; S. E. Cronin & Co. and 4 others, of Marshall, Mich.; V. C. Wattles & Son, of Battle Creek, Mich.; J. H. Halmer and 28 others, of Coldwater, Mich.; H. N. Potter Co. and 6 others, of Mulliken, Mich.; J. H. Palmer & Co. and 7 others, of Sunfield, Mich.; Mallory Bros. and 13 others, of Reading, Mich.; Rice & Co. and 10 others, of Mason, Mich.; W. D. Day and 10 others, of Galesburg, Mich.; Custer & Rogers and 7 others, of Eaton Rapids, Mich.; E. B. Hammond and 5 others, of Vermontville, Mich.; George T. Bullen and 21 others, of Albion, Mich.; the First National Bank and 21 others, of Marshall, Mich.; the Bellevue Bank and 12 others, of Bellevue, Mich.; E. C. Harmon and 14 others, of Charlotte, Mich., protesting against the parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SULZER: Telegram in nature of resolution of the German-American Alliance, assembled in State convention at Rochester, N. Y., favoring House resolution 166, providing for an investigation of immigration affairs; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of the German-American Alliance, of Jefferson County, Ohio, favoring House resolution 166, providing for an investigation of immigration affairs; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of Boh Podmol, 269 East Tenth Street, and John Zwierzanski, 102 St. Marks Place, New York City, asking for the adoption of House resolution 166, providing for an investigation of immigration affairs; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of the Columbus (Ohio) Branch of the German-American Alliance, of the Albany (N. Y.) Branch of the German-American Alliance, and of the Cincinnati (Ohio) Branch of the German-American Alliance, supporting House resolution 166; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, urging an amendment of the corporation-tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the Bee Hive Grange, No. 385, for parcels post as provided for in House bills 9844 and 8386; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, resolution of the joint committee of the National German-American Alliance, the United German Societies of New York, the Brooklyn branch of the National German-American Alliance, of New York, and the German-American Alliance of the State of New Jersey, approving House resolution 166; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of New York, in support of House resolution 166; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution in favor of House joint resolution 97; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: Petition of numerous citizens of New York, protesting against the passage of House bill 8887; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of New York State Bankers' Association, approving the Aldrich proposal for currency reform; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of B. G. Smith, of Elmira, N. Y., asking that the duty on raw and refined sugars be reduced; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIS: Papers to accompany a bill granting an increase of pension to William H. Kellison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill (H. R. 5947) granting a pension to Louie E. Read; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.